

ADA071119


**System
Development
Corporation**

LEVEL

**FINAL REPORT
TASK ORDER EG-11**

**RESULTS OF AN ASSESSMENT OF THE
NAVY LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION
AND TRAINING (LMET) LEADING PETTY
OFFICER (LPO) COURSE**

This document has been approved
for public release and sale; its
distribution is unlimited.

**DDC
RECEIVED
JUL 12 1979
C**

DDC FILE COPY

**PREPARED FOR:
HEAD, HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
AND PERSONAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
[COMNAVJILPERSCOM (N-6)] U.S. NAVY**

23 MARCH 1979

TM-(L)-6361/000/00

9 05 18 09

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

14

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS
BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

SDC

1. REPORT NUMBER

TM-(L)-6361/668/86

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

9

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

Results of an Assessment of the Navy Leadership
and Management Education and Training (LMET)
Leading Petty Officer (LPO) Course

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

Final Report

6

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)

Margaret E. Minton,
Katherine J. Saad
Gloria L. Grace

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

N00000-78-D-0651

10

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

System Development Corporation/
2400 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 9040610. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS

Task Order EG-11

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

Human Resource Management and Personal Affairs
Department [COMNAVMIIPERSCOM (N-6)]
Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C. 20370

12. REPORT DATE

23 Mar 1979

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

12/89p

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Requires approval of Controlling Office

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Leadership
ManagementAssessment
Evaluation

Competency-based training

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

△ This report presents results of an assessment of the Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET) Leading Petty Officer (LPO) course held at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, from 20 February through 2 March 1979. This course was designed to increase the effectiveness of Leading Petty Officers by providing them with competency skills found to be associated with superior performance in this billet. Two Navy instructors conducted the course that was assessed and 27 First Class Petty Officers participated as students in this course.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

339 900

Jm

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

The objectives of this assessment were: (1) To perform an on-site evaluation of the delivery of the course. Of specific concern was the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to teach the course effectively and in compliance with course objectives. (2) To review instructor guides and student journals. Emphasis was to be on the adequacy of materials as they affect delivery. Also any local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial course offering were to be evaluated. (3) To provide specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the LPO course.

This assessment utilized an analysis design based on comparisons across time and across units of instruction. The adequacy of the course materials was assessed during and after the course from the perspective of both students and instructors. Variables measured included: knowledge and skill acquisition, knowledge and skill usefulness, course objectives, course content and process, course materials, instructor effectiveness, and effectiveness of instructional methods.

Student perceptions and evaluations were obtained using assessment instruments designed for administration at the end of each day, each unit, and each week. On-site observations were also made throughout the course. These findings were amalgamated with results of the analysis of assessment instrument data to provide the basis for conclusions and recommendations presented in this report.

Eleven conclusions were drawn regarding the ability and proficiency of the Navy instructors to teach the course effectively. Five conclusions were drawn concerning the evaluation of the course materials and modifications as they affected course delivery. Due to insufficient data, only one general conclusion was drawn with respect to the third evaluation objective which was concerned with the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the LPO course. Based upon these conclusions, eight recommendations were made concerning improvements for the LPO course.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	<i>Just</i>
By	<i>San file</i>
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
<i>A</i>	

Unclassified

b SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

**FINAL REPORT
TASK ORDER EG-11**

**RESULTS OF AN ASSESSMENT OF THE
NAVY LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION
AND TRAINING (LMET) LEADING PETTY
OFFICER (LPO) COURSE**

**MARGARET E. MINTON
KATHERINE J. SAAD
GLORIA L. GRACE**

**PREPARED FOR:
HEAD, HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
AND PERSONAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
(COMNAVJILPERSCOM (N-8)) U.S. NAVY**

23 MARCH 1979

TM-(L)-6361/000/00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
 <u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u> 		
	Introduction.....	1
	Objectives.....	1
	Approach.....	2
	Conclusions.....	2
	Recommendations.....	5
 <u>SECTION 1 - STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES</u> 		
1.1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.2	Evaluation Objectives.....	1-1
1.3	Background Information.....	1-2
 <u>SECTION 2 - EVALUATION PROCEDURE</u> 		
2.1	Introduction.....	2-1
2.2	Evaluation Design.....	2-1
2.3	Variables Measured.....	2-1
2.4	Data Collection Procedures.....	2-2
2.5	Nature of Sample.....	2-3
2.6	Statistical Analysis.....	2-4
 <u>SECTION 3 - RESULTS</u> 		
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Findings by Instructional Unit.....	3-1
3.2.1	Comparative Items.....	3-2
3.2.2	Individual Units.....	3-4
	Unit 1.0.....	3-4
	Unit 2.0.....	3-6
	Unit 3.0.....	3-9
	Unit 4.0.....	3-13
	Unit 5.0.....	3-16
	Unit 6.0.....	3-17
	Unit 7.0.....	3-18
3.3	Findings Across Days.....	3-22
3.4	Findings Across Weeks.....	3-32
 <u>SECTION 4 - INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS</u> 		
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	Discussion.....	4-1
4.2.1	Course Delivery.....	4-1
4.2.2	Course Materials.....	4-3

SECTION 5 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Conclusions.....	5-1
5.3	Recommendations.....	5-4
	Appendix A.....	A-1
	Appendix B.....	B-1
	Appendix C.....	C-1

APPROACH

The LMET LPO course design was based on results of research on the competencies of superior and average Naval personnel. Developed as a two-week training program, this course currently consists of seven units. The first is an introduction to the course, the following five units deal with specific competencies, and the final unit concerns competency integration and application.

This assessment of the LMET LPO course delivery and instructional materials utilized an analysis design based on comparisons across time and across units of instruction. The adequacy of the instructional materials was assessed during and after the course from the perspective of both students and instructors. Variables measured in this assessment included: knowledge and skill acquisition, knowledge and skill usefulness, course objectives, course content and process, course materials, instructor effectiveness, and effectiveness of instructional methods.

Student perceptions and evaluations were obtained using assessment instruments designed for administration at the end of each day, each unit, and each week. The data were analyzed and results were interpreted. On-site observations were also made throughout the course. Observation findings were amalgamated with results of the analysis of assessment instrument data in this report to provide the basis for conclusions and recommendations presented below.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on results and findings obtained in this assessment of the LMET LPO course, the following conclusions were drawn with respect to the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors:

- The LPO course participants appeared to enjoy the training a great deal and considered it to be useful. Their attitude can be attributed in part to the environment created by gathering in one place people in similar positions and with similar experience.

- With some exceptions, Navy instructors were found to be effective in presenting course content through lectures and in conducting group exercises. Delivery was less effective when sessions were rushed because of tight time constraints and when explanations and instructions were poorly given.
- Although the Navy instructors' processing behavior varied, it was found to be generally ineffective and often too rigid. Also, the climate in the classroom ranged from fair to poor. The most significant deficiency was the absence of care to insure that students felt free to speak and were responded to in a non-pejorative manner.
- The amount of material to be covered and the number of learning activities scheduled appeared to be somewhat excessive for a ten-day course and extremely so for the allotted time of nine days. The time constraint may have contributed to some of the deficiencies in areas such as classroom climate and processing effectiveness.
- The enabling objectives of the LPO course were neither presented in any written material used in the course nor mentioned in the classroom.
- The LPO course content and process were found to be oriented toward the acquisition of knowledge. The development and improvement of subcompetency skills was given inadequate attention.
- Participants seemed to understand much of the course content. However, there was apparently some confusion about the material which was hurriedly delivered and/or inadequately processed.
- With some exceptions, the instructional methods used in the LPO course were found to be effective and comfortably balanced. However, only a few lessons included a skill practice activity in which students were able to use the effective behavior and to receive feedback on their skill performance.

- Participants' knowledge acquisition level appeared to range from poor to very good. The amount learned seemed to be directly related to unit length.
- The level of participants' skill acquisition appeared to range from very poor to adequate. Acquisition seemed to be greater during the units which included some adequate skill practice activities.
- A large part of the course content was found to be relevant to Navy issues and LPO job responsibilities. Some of the films and readings, however, were couched in a civilian setting. Participants appeared to have difficulty relating to these course materials.

Conclusions related to the adequacy of course materials as they affected delivery, and modifications made in the delivery were:

- Participants seemed to benefit from material in the Student Journal, and this material was found to be relevant to LPO job responsibilities. However, enabling objectives were omitted from the Student Journal, and some of the material was out of sequence.
- Students seemed to enjoy the self-assessment instruments--the Learning Style Inventory and the Motivational Style Inventory. Although the latter was not interpreted thoroughly, it was used adequately as an introduction to the topic of managerial styles.
- Films and the videotape seemed to be effective and generally somewhat relevant to the duties of an LPO excepting for films taken from civilian sources. Posted charts were adequate for use as learning aids although improvements in legibility and accuracy were needed.
- The Instructor Guide consisted of a handwritten set of notes designed to supplement the original guide as a revision. When used as the instructors' only manual, as it was used in this course, this supplement is inadequate.

- There was no indication that the LPO supplement was being modified during the course.

Concerning specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the LPO course, data collected from only one LPO class is insufficient for making an adequate determination. However, based on available data it was concluded that Navy instructors need to achieve an adequate proficiency level in all areas covered in instructor training, including group facilitation training, and to maintain this level when in the classroom. This is required to insure that there are not areas of weakness reflected in the performance of their instructional responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on findings and conclusions of this assessment, the following recommendations were made:

- Implementation of the overall design of the LNET LPO course should be continued and this training should be made available to all LPOs in the Navy.
- Navy instructors should receive additional training in group facilitation in order to improve their processing skills and their ability to set and maintain a favorable classroom climate. Consideration should be given to increasing the emphasis on group facilitation skills in the LNET-I course and to providing a separate course in group processing for use in on-the-job training.
- The LPO course curriculum should be examined with regard to the possibility of decreasing the amount of material and increasing the amount of time and number of skill-building activities allotted for each content area. Also, LPO course content should be compared overall with LNET objectives and modifications made to bring the LPO

course better in line with LMET objectives. A shift from the focus on cognitive learning to skill performance is recommended. Much of the material on conceptual models and leadership theories should be deleted and the subcompetency skills should be more heavily emphasized both through lecture/discussion sessions and skill practice activities.

- Participants should be informed of terminal objectives for the LPO course and of enabling objectives specific to each unit--both verbally in the classroom, allowing for discussion, and in the Student Journal.
- Course material drawn from civilian business sources should be redesigned to reflect Navy issues and the specific job responsibilities of LPOs. Consideration should be given to the possibility of developing Navy materials which present similar content in a context relevant to the Navy, particularly for the lessons on organizational climate and performance counseling. Consideration should be given to including a description and discussion of the HRM Survey in the curriculum.
- The LPO Student Journal should be reorganized to conform to the course schedule and to include terminal and enabling objectives.
- An updated version of the LMET LPO Instructor Guide that reflects course revisions should be produced and implemented in the course as soon as possible. Specific instructions about how to shorten the course, if necessary, should be provided. Subsequent revisions should be approved, distributed, and printed in the Instructor Guide as soon as they are made. All LPO course instructors should use the same version of the Instructor Guide.
- The Navy should take positive action steps to ensure that the knowledge base and instructional skills of Navy instructors in the LMET program have reached criterion in all areas before instructors enter the classroom and that these skills are maintained to criterion thereafter. More emphasis on measuring the effectiveness with which LMET content and group facilitation skills are mastered should be incorporated in

the training of LMET instructors. Standardized techniques for measuring the proficiency of LMET instructors in the job setting should be developed and implemented as soon as possible.

SECTION 1 - STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Findings from the on-site evaluation of the Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET) course for Leading Petty Officers (LPOs) are presented in this report. This LMET LPO course was held at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, from 20 February to 2 March 1979. The evaluation was conducted by System Development Corporation for the Human Resource Management Division (NMPC-6C) under Task EG-11 on Contract NO0600-78-D-0651. This report contains a description of the course evaluation procedures, results of the assessment instrument data and the observations, interpretation of the findings, and conclusions and recommendations concerning the course.

1.2 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this evaluation task were specified in Task Order EG-11 as follows:

- (1) To perform an on-site evaluation of the delivery of the course. Of specific concern are the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to effectively teach/deliver the course in compliance with course objectives.
- (2) To review instructor guides and student journals. Emphasis should be on the adequacy of materials as they affect delivery, and also to evaluate any local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial offering of the course.
- (3) To provide specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the LPO course.

1.3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The LMET courses were developed by McBer and Company based on research involving the identification of the competencies of superior Naval personnel. The LPO course was designed as a two-week training program with the objectives of increasing awareness and building skills in the job competencies required for effective performance of the duties of a Leading Petty Officer. The current LPO course consists of seven units. The first is an introduction to the course, and the final unit concerns competency integration and application. The remaining five units of instruction each present a competency identified by research to differentiate between superior and average leadership and management performance as a Leading Petty Officer.

SECTION 2 - EVALUATION PROCEDURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The procedure used in the evaluation of the LMET LPO course is presented in this section. The evaluation design is described and discussed. Also, a description of the variables measured and the data collection procedures is included. Finally, the research sample is described and the statistical analysis procedures are discussed.

2.2 EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation of the LMET LPO course curriculum and delivery utilized an analysis design based on comparisons across time and across units of instruction. The adequacy of the course materials was assessed from the user's point of view during the course and again following course completion.

2.3 VARIABLES MEASURED

The effectiveness of the LMET LPO course was assessed by examining perceptions relevant to the following variables:

1. Knowledge and skill acquisition
2. Knowledge and skill usefulness
3. Course objectives
4. Course content and process
5. Course materials
6. Instructor effectiveness
7. Effectiveness of instructional methods

2.4 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Student perceptions and evaluations were solicited through the use of three types of assessment instruments containing items to be answered on three- or five-point Likert-type scales. The purpose of the assessment instruments was explained to the participants, and care was taken to assure the students that their responses would be anonymous and available only to SDC personnel.

Data on the instructional units were collected with the seven end-of-unit questionnaires. One of these instruments was administered to the participants immediately following the conclusion of the appropriate unit. Items on this questionnaire concerned unit length, amount learned in the unit overall, and potential application of the general competency skills. Questions asked which were specific to each unit concerned the amount learned and the usefulness on the job of each of the knowledge areas covered, the amount of leadership and management skills learned from each activity, the usefulness on the job of these skills, the amount of emphasis placed on each subcompetency skill during the unit, and the job usefulness of this skill. Daily perceptions were recorded on the end-of-day questionnaires which were completed by the participants either at the conclusion of the day of instruction or before the following day's lessons began. Students were asked to assess the day's session based upon their general attitude, ease of understanding, relevance to an LPO's duties, instructor effectiveness, and recommendation of the course to other LPOs. In addition, participants evaluated the amount of time spent each day on the various types of learning activities and the help each activity provided in their learning leadership and management skills. The end-of-day questionnaire also asked the students which subcompetency skills they had learned something about that day and of those about which something was learned, the three skills that would be the most useful to them on the job. Finally, a course overview questionnaire was administered to the participants near the end of each week of the course. This instrument contained general questions about the course overall and was designed to provide cumulative assessment data. Items on this questionnaire concerned course effectiveness, course objectives, personal expectations, learning from participant interaction, general attitude, and effectiveness of the instructors and the instructional methods. On all three types of questionnaires, at least one open-ended question was asked in order to encourage comments and suggestions.

In addition to participants' assessments, a subjective evaluation of the course was made by an SDC observer who was present during all but the first day of the LPO course. The SDC assessor observed the course from the back of the classroom with attention directed toward the instructors' performance, student response, instructor interactions with participants, and participant interactions with one another. Information on the course of instruction was documented daily on a worksheet log including the time, unit segment, type of presentation, quality of information presented, participants' comments, and general remarks for each segment of the course. The observer also completed checklists assessing specific aspects of the course, including curriculum design, participant attitude and response, instructor abilities, and organizational fit of each module. The appropriate sections of the Instructor Guide and the Student Journal and all handouts were studied as each lesson was presented, and an assessment was made as to the adequacy of these materials for the particular user. Further and more detailed examination of the course materials was conducted following the LPO course. Finally, the observer engaged in informal conversation with the participants and instructors during class breaks.

The variables measured by each source of data are presented in Table 2-1. Results of all the data gathered are presented and discussed in Section 3 of this report.

2.5 NATURE OF SAMPLE

Twenty-seven First Class Petty Officers participated as students in the LPO course. All the participants were men, although their racial and ethnic backgrounds and their career fields were varied. Six of the students were radiomen (RM), and three were machinist mates (MM). There were two each in the air controlman (AC), operations specialist (OS), storekeeper (SK), and yeoman (YN) rates. Most of the participants were stationed aboard ship, and the majority were from commands in the Norfolk area.

Table 2-1. Variables Measured by Data Source.

Evaluation Variables	End-of-Unit Questionnaire	End-of-Day Questionnaire	Course Overview Questionnaire	Observer Assessments
Knowledge and Skill Acquisition	✓	✓	✓	✓
Knowledge and Skill Usefulness	✓			✓
Course Objectives	✓		✓	✓
Course Content/ Process	✓	✓	✓	✓
Course Materials		✓		✓
Instructor Effectiveness		✓	✓	✓
Instructional Method Effectiveness	✓	✓	✓	✓

2.6 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The questionnaire data were analyzed manually at SDC immediately following the conclusion of the course. Mean responses were computed for each of the questionnaire items which were answered on a numerical scale. Comments and suggestions were grouped for summarized reporting, and representative or unusual comments were selected for reference in this report.

SECTION 3 - RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Findings from the assessment instrument data and observer evaluations are described in this section. Participant and observer assessments for each of the seven instructional units are reported first followed by the findings across days of the course. Finally, results from the weekly cumulative assessments are reported.

Caution should be exercised in interpreting the data gathered from participants. Very favorable responses to assessment questionnaire items are not uncommon for this type of training. Also when respondents assign consistently high ratings to the scaled items, response variability is small, making data interpretation very difficult.

3.2 FINDINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT

The LPO course was made up of seven instructional units. Because one of the regularly scheduled class days was a Federal holiday, the course, normally a ten-day training program, was taught in nine days of instruction. The schedule followed in this LPO course is presented in Appendix A.

Three end-of-unit questionnaire items were asked at the conclusion of each unit to provide comparative data. The remaining questions, although they measure the same variables across units, are specific to the unit content and process. These items were answered on a five-point Likert-type scale, on which a five represents the most favorable response and a three is a rating in the mid-range. In addition, participants were asked to provide comments or suggestions about the unit. Mean responses, participant comments, and assessor's observations are described together in the following paragraphs.

3.2.1 COMPARATIVE ITEMS

Mean responses to the questions asked at the end of each unit are presented in Table 3-1. The first item on each of these questionnaires concerned unit length. On this question, a response of one indicates that the unit was too short; three, about right; and five, too long. Respondents considered no unit too short, and most were judged to be slightly too long. Participants rated Unit 2: Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness, which lasted 15.5 hours, and Unit 6: Problem Solving, a six-hour unit, the longest, although their length was not considered inappropriate. Units 5: Process Management and 7: Competency Application were both judged to be about right in length. These blocks of instruction lasted 2.3 hours and 9.5 hours, respectively. Observation findings indicated that although Unit 2 was a lengthy block of instruction, the time allotted was required in order to present and process information on this key competency. Also, the observer found that Unit 5, which concerned the process management competency, was much shorter than optimal. Although instructors mentioned that lessons on process management would also be included in the Unit 6 instruction, no further direct reference was made to this competency.

Following each of the five competency units (2 through 6), participants were asked how much the unit taught them about the specific competency in their jobs as LPOs. At the end of Unit 7, they were asked to judge how much was taught about relating competencies to LPO job functions. On these items, a response of the five indicated a great deal was taught; three, a moderate amount. Ratings on all these items were moderately high to high. A large amount was considered to be taught in Unit 2 about the need for concern for efficiency and effectiveness. This unit was the longest and covered the greatest amount of material of the seven units. Participants felt that the least was taught about process management, although they judged that more than a moderate amount was taught. Observation results substantiate the participants' assessments that a great deal of information was presented on efficiency and effectiveness in Unit 2 and that the material generally had to do with an LPO's job functions. Units 3, 4, 5 and 6, however, appeared to be less effective in terms of what was taught about the use of the specific competencies in the work situation. Again, Unit 5 in particular was very

Table 3-1. Participant Perceptions of Course Units.
(Means)

Question	Unit						
	1.0: Introduction	2.0: Efficiency and Effectiveness	3.0: Use of Influence	4.0: Advising and Counseling	5.0: Process Management	6.0: Problem Solving	7.0: Competency Application
• In your opinion, how appropriate was the length of the unit?	3.15	3.26	3.11	3.07	3.00	3.23	3.00
• How much did this unit teach you about (the specific competency) in your job as an LP0?	**	4.41	3.96	4.19	3.89	4.08	4.00
• About what percentage of the techniques for (the specific competency) taught in this course do you expect you will use during the next two to three weeks on the job?	**	652*	562*	672*	672*	662*	692*

* Mean percentage

** Not applicable

short and did not adequately cover process management information and skills. The final unit on competency application appeared to be effective as a summary and in teaching the participants how to integrate and apply the skills they had learned.

In estimating the percentage of competency techniques they would use during the next two to three weeks on the job, most participants were fairly optimistic. Approximately two-thirds of the competency skill techniques taught in each unit were considered immediately useful on the job. A slight exception to this was the estimated applicability of the techniques for being influential taught in Unit 3: Skillful Use of Influence. Participants felt they would be able to use only a little more than half of these techniques on the job in the first few weeks after completing the LMET course. In the observer's opinion, participants were overly optimistic in estimating their future use of the competency techniques. Little opportunity was allowed for practicing skills during most of the units, as most of the time was devoted to the presentation of cognitive information. In addition, material and exercises were not consistently relevant to the responsibilities of an LPO in the Navy. This deficiency may have hindered the desired skill acquisition. These issues will be discussed in detail in later sections of this report.

3.2.2 INDIVIDUAL UNITS

Unit 1.0: Introduction (20 February 1979). Mean responses to questionnaire items specific to Unit 1 are presented in Table B-1. A response of five on the amount learned items indicates a great deal learned, and on the helpfulness items, a five indicates a great deal of help. On both questions, a three is a mid-range response. Ratings were moderate to high, with most in the moderately high range. Participants felt they had learned more about learning styles than the other knowledge areas ($M_n = 4.38$) and that this information was the most helpful in preparing them for the LMET course ($M_n = 4.12$). According to the LPO course instructors, the lesson on learning styles lasted an hour and a half and included a self-assessment instrument (Learning Style Inventory), a lecture/discussion session, and a small group exercise. The area about which the least was considered to have been learned

was the reason for change from LMT to LMET (Mn = 3.63). Both this knowledge and the information on competency-based research, although considered to be of some help in course preparation, were judged to be the least helpful of the learning areas in this unit (Mn = 3.36 and 3.37, respectively). Conversion to LMET, according to the instructors, was not covered in detail in the introductory lessons; however, competency-based research was discussed in the course introduction.

Also part of the questionnaire administered at the end of Unit 1 was the question: "How did it happen that you are here in attendance at the LMET LPO course? (Did you volunteer? If so, why? How much did you want to come?) Explain briefly." Over two-thirds of the participants (69%) wrote that they had volunteered for the leadership training. Reasons for their interest had to do with the need for skill improvement, the desire to learn more about oneself, and recommendations from others who had attended the course. Approximately one-fifth of the students stated that they were sent to the course by their command. All but two of these LPOs, however, expressed positive expectations. One student who had not volunteered was unhappy with his orders. He wrote, "I was chosen by my supervisors to attend this class on Friday of last week. It is my opinion that the class was assigned at this particular time to give me something to do. Our command is currently at a stand down between exercises." Another student who was less negative wrote that although he realized the necessity for such a course, his ship was to come out of overhaul in two weeks and at that time he felt his energies could be used more effectively at his command. Most of the students, however, were looking forward to the course and expressed a high regard for leadership training, as the respondent who wrote "I figure you can never learn enough about leadership and management. Every course you can attend, every bit of information you can pick up is just that much more of an advantage to you."

When asked for comments or suggestions about Unit 1, most of the participants wrote nothing. A few generally positive comments were received, however, having to do with amount learned and climate. One student wrote "The absence of the standard Navy lesson plan format is its biggest plus." One complaint was received by a participant who responded, "It seems to me that a lot of people read things into the problem and we wind up spending a little too much time on some things." Only one specific suggestion was made by a student who

thought the group exercise on expectations should be eliminated. Another participant wrote that he was "hoping to get more into the concept of transactional analysis."

In summary, participants were quite positive about the introductory unit and according to their questionnaire responses they appeared enthusiastic about the LPO course. It is important to note that the instrument designed to assess Unit 1 was not administered until the morning of Day 2 after the second unit had been in progress for more than two hours.¹

Unit 2.0: Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness (20, 21 and 22 February 1979). Results of the questionnaire administered at the conclusion of Unit 2 are presented in Tables B-2 through B-4. Again, a five on the amount learned scale represents a great deal learned, and on the usefulness scale, a five indicates that the learning is very useful. Mean ratings on amount learned about efficiency and effectiveness knowledge areas and their usefulness on the job were moderately high. (See Table B-2.) Participants felt they had learned a fairly large amount about each of the four areas, particularly about the three social motives ($M_n = 4.26$). All the information was judged to be quite useful on the job as an LPO. Again, three social motives was the area given the highest rating on this dimension also ($M_n = 4.22$) while organizational climate was considered to be less useful to the participants than the other areas ($M_n = 3.89$). The other two knowledge areas assessed were categories of achievement thinking and specific behaviors of effective and ineffective LPOs. Although the presentation on the achievement, affiliation and power motives was a short one, it was made early in the course as a foundation for other material and reference was made to types of motivation continuously throughout the unit.

The lesson on categories of achievement thinking was presented with the use of the stick figure, and the observer noticed that students appeared somewhat confused by the many abbreviations (e.g., FA: anticipation of failure, F+: positive feelings). In addition, the discussion on these categories was

¹The SDC assessor was prevented from attending the first day of the course due to flight cancellations because of bad weather.

slightly rushed and the climate was less than ideal. For example, in processing case studies, a typical comment made by an instructor was, "This is a world block. Does anyone see it as anything else? OK, moving along..." The same classroom atmosphere problem was evident during the introductory lesson on organizational climate. Participants were asked to read descriptions of organizational climate factors aloud from their Student Journals before the Harvard Business School film was shown. Although the film demonstrated climate dimensions clearly, the introduction was so ineffective in preparing the participants that the points made in the film were not readily understood. The students were able to discuss the various climates following the film although disagreement among the participants was often evident. While a difference of opinion was being discussed, the instructors often reconciled it by "averaging" the two responses and marking the climate at a midpoint between two opinions on the particular characteristic. In many cases, this type of conflict was often caused by an obvious misunderstanding of the climate factor definitions and would have been more appropriately used as a basis for a clarifying discussion. Instead, one comment representative of those made by the instructors was, "We could argue this all day. The group consensus was medium high on conformity. Now moving on..." Examples of effective and ineffective behaviors were presented clearly through the case studies, and because these readings were written expressly for LPOs, the information appeared to be very useful. The processing of these cases was also handled more effectively by the instructors than some of the other lessons.

In assessing the units in terms of subcompetency skill areas, a response of five on the emphasis item indicates a great deal of emphasis was placed on the subskill. Participants felt that a moderately large amount of emphasis had been placed on each of the eight skills taught in Unit 2 and that all were to be quite useful on the job. (See Table B-3.) Participants felt that more emphasis was placed on the skill of being cooperative and promoting cooperation to increase productivity ($M_n = 4.07$) than on the other subcompetency areas. The skills of recognizing when others achieve a quality standard and taking personal responsibility for immediate action to solve problems were considered to be emphasized the least ($M_n = 3.63$ for each). In judging usefulness on the job, participants rated the skill of looking for ways to improve work the highest ($M_n = 4.59$). Lower usefulness ratings were

assigned to the subcompetency skills of recognizing when others achieve a quality standard and informing the chain of command (Mn = 4.04 for each). The observer agrees with the participants that a great deal of emphasis was placed on each subcompetency skill. All the skill areas appeared to be emphasized to approximately equal degrees, although recognizing when others achieve a quality standard and promoting cooperation were seen as being somewhat less emphasized than the others. The finding regarding the latter skill is in disagreement with the participants' opinions.

Five primary learning activities were used as instructional aids in Unit 2. Ratings on these activities on both amount learned and usefulness ranged from moderate to moderately high. (See Table B-4.) Participants felt that the Seabee Work Center, an exercise in several efficiency and effectiveness subcompetency skills, was the best activity on both dimensions. This exercise required a full afternoon of class time, and the students perceived that they had learned more from the activity than any other lesson in this unit and that the information would be the most useful to them on their jobs (Mn = 4.15 in both cases). The lowest rating on amount learned was given to the Harvard Business School film about organizational climate (Mn = 3.31). Although a moderately large amount was felt to have been learned about leadership and management skills from the Target Practice exercise (Mn = 3.50), the students considered this information to be the least useful to them on the job (Mn = 3.19).

Observer findings indicate that the most effective classroom activities during Unit 2 were the Seabee Work Center and the case studies. The Seabee Work Center exercise was managed well, and the instructors were able to maintain the focus of the activity on the processes and not on the task itself, as is often difficult for this type of "hands-on" exercise. The discussion following the exercise was also well done, although it was somewhat rushed. The instructor was able to tie together learning points made throughout the unit in a perceptive manner. The processing of the Target Practice exercise was accomplished effectively, and an excellent example of risk taking on the job was offered by a student and utilized well by the instructor. However, all the participants may not have benefited from this learning activity, since during the discussion several seemed to concentrate on the ring throwing rather than goal setting and risk taking. Participants appeared to enjoy the

Motivational Style Questionnaire, and although the results of this self-assessment instrument were very briefly discussed, a satisfactory lecture and discussion session was held on the subject of motivational/managerial styles.

When asked for comments or suggestions about the second unit, less than half of the students responded. Most of the comments were favorable and general in nature. Suggestions for change concerned the learning activities. One participant felt that the Harvard Business School film on organizational climate "should have been explained briefly and summarized." Because the film was actually introduced with an explanation and was followed with a discussion around climate factors, this student may have intended to suggest that the film not be shown but that the information concerning the film should be presented and discussed as a replacement for the film.

Two participants complained about the Target Practice exercise and the Seabee Work Center. One student wrote that both were too long and the processing was too drawn out. The other felt that his dislike for these activities was "probably due to my predominate learning style of CE (concrete experience) backed up by RO (reflective observation)." Finally, one student commented that the homework from Day 1 was tough and required "gut level self-assessment." He wrote that after spending three hours working on this assignment, which was to write out examples of how he used the subcompetency skills on his job, he felt he had made a real investment. This student also wrote "I believe I needed more time on determining just what I got out of the different exercises. Also, I'd like to do something with this self-assessment information--perhaps do some essay type activity as homework which takes in how I see myself as fitting into my present situation at my command. Relate new data to present situation, in other words."

Unit 3.0: Skillful Use of Influence (23 and 26 February 1979). Participants' assessments of the unit on the skillful use of influence competency are displayed in Tables B-5 through B-7 and discussed in the following paragraphs. Three major areas of knowledge were presented in this 8.5-hour unit: categories of power thinking, specific behaviors of influential and non-influential LPOs, and importance of emotional self-control. Participants

considered the last area the most effective in terms of the amount they learned (Mn = 4.46) and the usefulness of the information on their jobs (Mn = 4.59). (See Table B-5.) The respondents felt that they had also learned a large amount about specific behaviors of influential and non-influential LPOs (Mn = 4.35) but that this knowledge would be of less use to them (Mn = 3.85) than the information on emotional self-control. Categories of power thinking, although still rated moderately high, were judged the least effective of the learning areas on both amount learned (Mn = 3.96) and job usefulness (Mn = 3.74).

The observer reported that the lesson on emotional self-control was augmented by an excerpt from "The Caine Mutiny" and a discussion on the lack of self-control that was evident in this film. Participants appeared to be involved in this lesson, and they seemed to recognize situations where emotional self-control was needed but was missing. However, no opportunity was allowed for practicing the skill of self-control, and the value of being assertive, rather than passive or aggressive, was not mentioned. Two self-control worksheets in the Student Journal were assigned for students to complete at their own convenience. These were self-assessment exercises asking participants to think of personal emotional "triggers," how they handled them in the past, and what they would do differently now. This assignment was not discussed further. Thus, it appeared that the LPOs in the class know how to identify poor emotional self-control, but there is no evidence that they acquired any personal skills in this area. The discussions on the case studies which involved behaviors of influential and non-influential LPOs were well managed and participants appeared to learn an adequate amount in this area. The presentation on power thinking was a short part of the introduction to Unit 3 and the concept of socialized versus personalized power was mentioned only one other time during the unit.

Four primary subcompetencies were identified for the LPO skillful use of influence competency. One of these skill areas, appropriately using authoritarian control to reach unit objectives, was further broken down into four subskills. Of these eight influence skills, participants felt that practicing emotional self-control when dealing with conflict was the subcompetency most emphasized (Mn = 4.26) and most useful to them on the job

as an LPO (Mn = 4.52). (See Table B-6.) The other skills were rated moderately high on both characteristics; however, mediating or advocating someone else's position was considered both the least emphasized (Mn = 3.56) and the least useful (Mn = 3.74). Participants felt that the skill of attempting to convince others was emphasized to a fairly large degree (Mn = 4.07) and that it was also a skill that would be of use to them on the job (Mn = 4.19). The observer felt that the eight subcompetencies were given unequal emphasis, ranging from very little on mediates or advocates someone else's position--to a great deal of emphasis on practicing emotional self-control when dealing with conflict. The differences between this latter subcompetency and facing conflict honestly but tactfully was not made clear, and when a student asked for clarification, the instructor was unable to provide it. Motivating people to work by use of rewards and attempting to convince others were also given more attention than some of the other skill areas.

Learning activities used in Unit 3 included case studies, role plays, two exercises, and a film. Again, ratings were moderately high both on amount learned and skill usefulness. (See Table B-7.) Participants felt that they had learned the most from the film, an excerpt from "The Caine Mutiny" (Mn = 4.11). The case studies were rated the lowest of the five activities on amount learned (Mn = 3.58). In assessing the usefulness of skills gained, participants rated the role plays the highest (Mn = 4.00). Managing a new work center, the last activity of the unit which was designed to allow students to integrate efficiency and effectiveness skills with influence subcompetencies, was also considered to involve skills very useful to an LPO (Mn = 3.92). Although students felt they had learned more than some (Mn = 3.85) from the other exercise in Unit 3, the welfare and recreation award exercise in personal influence, the skills gained were judged to be less useful than those acquired from the other activities (Mn = 3.56).

The SDC observer's assessments of the learning activities do not closely parallel those of the participants. Although it was obvious that the students enjoyed "The Caine Mutiny" film excerpt, the role plays appeared to be the most effective in demonstrating the differences between influential and non-influential behavior of an LPO on the job. The instructors performed before the students in two role plays, which were excellent dramatizations of

effective and ineffective LPO/subordinate relations in a work situation. This activity was a good choice for the early part of the unit. The welfare and recreation award exercise in personal influence would have also been very effective if there had been a way for each student to participate. The design of the exercise, however, allowed only four LPOs to practice their influence skills, and although this was demonstrated in front of the classroom, the activity could have been improved if wider participation were allowed. The Unit 3 case studies were also well-written, with the exception of the first one used in the unit. This case was written through the eyes of a Command Collateral Duty Alcohol Advisor, and it appeared that many of the participants could not relate the case to their own situations.

Participants were asked several additional questions at the end of Unit 3. Their perceptions of how much they learned from the other participants about the skillful use of influence were moderately high (Mn = 3.74). The respondents felt that using the techniques they had learned in the unit, they would be quite effective in influencing their subordinates (Mn = 3.93), slightly less effective in influencing their peers (Mn = 3.78), and even less effective, although still somewhat effective, in influencing their supervisors (Mn = 3.52). In addition, participants felt they had learned more than an average amount about empowering others (Mn = 3.63) and that this skill would be quite useful to them on the job (Mn = 4.04).

Less than one-third of the students responded to the item soliciting comments or suggestions for Unit 3. Each comment received was favorable. A typical response to this item was "To me it was a very important unit which not only pertains to our job as LPOs but will also be beneficial in our day-to-day lives concerning personal as well as social interactions." One suggestion was made by a student who wrote "Would like to see examples of empowering a supervisor to achieve a subordinate's idea or viewpoint." The observer agreed with this last comment. None of the lessons on influencing and empowering involved LPO/supervisor interactions. However, it was obvious from several remarks overheard in the classroom that this is an issue of concern to Leading Petty Officers.

Unit 4.0: Advising and Counseling (26 and 27 February 1979). Data gathered from the questionnaire administered at the end of Unit 4 are discussed in the following paragraphs and tabled in Appendix B. Four general knowledge areas were covered in the advising and counseling unit, and participants felt that they had learned a large amount about each. The Referral Decision Guidelines was the area about which students perceived the greatest amount was learned (Mn = 4.31), followed by performance analysis (Mn = 4.27), Navy helping resources available (Mn = 4.19), and the four types of counseling (Mn = 4.15). All the information gained was seen as very useful to LPOs in a work situation, particularly the knowledge acquired in the performance analysis area (Mn = 4.30). Knowledge about the Referral Decision Guidelines and the types of counseling was also judged to be useful (Mn = 4.22 for each), as was to a lesser extent, the information on Navy helping resources available (Mn = 4.04).

Observation findings indicate that a 34-minute lecture/discussion session was held on the four types of counseling. Later in the unit, participants were assigned one of the four types of situations to use as a basis for counseling practice. At this point, some confusion about the four types of counseling was evident, and the instructor repeated the definitions. Because this subject was not given as much attention as some of the others, it appeared that only a moderate amount was learned about this area. Navy helping resources was given a longer session, in which participants offered names of resources and the instructor wrote them on newsprint. After a long list was compiled, students defined the helping resources and gave examples of their use. Finally, the instructor made several additions to the list. This information could have been included in a written handout for students to refer to later, and the time could have been used more effectively for counseling practice. Also, during this time period the Referral Decision Guidelines were to be discussed; however, no mention was made of any specific guidelines. It appears that in assessing the Unit 4 knowledge areas, participants confused these two topics. The lesson on performance analysis was aided by "The Dryden File" film; however, no opportunity was allowed for actual practice of writing an analysis from a case study. This activity would have been very useful.

Eight skill areas were part of the advising and counseling unit. Four of these are major subcompetencies, one of which has four additional subskills. Moderate to large amounts of emphasis were considered by participants to have been placed on each skill area, and each skill was judged as quite useful to an LPO. Accurately hearing the problem was rated the highest on emphasis and usefulness (Mn = 4.31 and 4.44, respectively). Listening to others and suggesting and clarifying alternatives were also considered to have been well emphasized (Mn = 4.23 and 4.12, respectively) and to be applicable skills for an LPO (Mn = 4.30 for each). Seeking out persons with problems was judged to have been emphasized the least, although perceived emphasis was still more than some (Mn = 3.69). The primary subcompetency of demonstrating positive concern was considered the least useful of the skill areas (Mn = 4.00), followed by seeking out persons with problems and listening to others (Mn = 4.07 for each). The observer agreed with the students that accurately hearing the problem was the most heavily emphasized subcompetency in Unit 4, and that seeking out persons with problems was the least emphasized. However, no attention, outside of the subcompetency introduction, was given to this latter skill. Clarifying alternatives was well covered, but suggesting alternatives was not discussed. The instructor was careful to inform the LPOs that they must avoid attacking a counselee's values and morals and that counseling material should be restricted to observable behavior. This warning may have caused participants to confine themselves to thinking about clarifying the counselee's statements rather than offering recommendations.

Three learning activities were included in the advising and counseling unit. Videotapes of ineffective and effective counseling were shown early in the unit and a discussion on counseling behavior followed. Participants were also given the opportunity to practice some of the skills they were learning in a counseling role play with a partner. Also, a film, "The Dryden File," which concerned a performance problem and the counseling required, was shown. The participants felt they had learned a large amount from both the videotapes (Mn = 4.16) and the film (Mn = 4.08), but somewhat less from the role plays (Mn = 3.56). The leadership and management skills gained from "The Dryden File" film, however, were considered the most useful (Mn = 4.23). Students felt that the videotape had also been quite useful (Mn = 4.12). The skills

learned from participating in the role plays were considered useful to a lesser extent ($M_n = 3.69$). As the role play assignments were made, the observer noted confusion among the students, and several participants commented that they didn't know what they were supposed to do. The instructor's attempts to clarify were also not very effective. In addition, participants were given only five minutes to practice advising and counseling. Such a short period was insufficient for thorough skill practice.

In an attempt to assess the degree to which skill acquisition feedback was given, students were asked "How much feedback about your own ability to perform the skills needed to be an effective advisor and counselor did you feel you received in this unit?" Ratings on this item were fairly high indicating that participants felt they had received more than a moderate amount of feedback ($M_n = 3.63$). This feedback occurred following the role plays, and it may have been more complete if a longer period had been allowed for the role playing activity.

More than half of the participants offered comments and suggestions about Unit 4. Again, most wrote general praise, such as "Very effective and informative," and "I believe it to be one of the more important units since it discusses direct dealings and intercommunications between people, which is what life is all about." The film and the videotape were commended as helpful learning aids. One student wrote that the counseling role plays were effective and that he received much needed feedback on his performance in that area. Two comments were received which indicated that more time and emphasis on advising and counseling was desired. One respondent asked "What happened to pages 4-18 to 4-92?" This student was referring to a large section of the Student Journal which contained information on an individual counseling exercise and readings on Navy drug and alcohol programs. These portions were not used in this course, and no reference was made by the instructors to either section in the Student Journal. Finally, one participant complained about the classroom climate he experienced in Unit 4. He wrote "Every individual has a lot to contribute and it's not fair to the contributor for the instructors to determine the value of his contribution or his motives for contributing." No further examples were offered, and no other respondents made similar complaints. The observer noted, however, that both instructors

frequently paid no attention to remarks made by participants and instead, continued with the material. There was a need to conserve time; however, on several occasions participants were attempting to answer another student's question or to clarify a point of discussion and the instructor answered the question himself, ignoring the contribution from the class.

Unit 5.0: Process Management (27 February 1979). A short questionnaire was administered following the 2.3-hour unit on process management. The results of this assessment are shown in Table B-11 and discussed below. Three subcompetency areas of process management were identified for superior LPOs: optimizing people and resources, effectively monitoring the implementation of a plan, and giving effective performance feedback. Participants felt that these skill areas were given approximately equal amounts of emphasis. The optimizing and giving feedback subcompetencies were considered emphasized to a fairly high degree (Mn = 3.88 for each), as was the monitoring skill (Mn = 3.81). The students estimated that all the areas would be of much use to them on the job, particularly the skill of giving effective performance feedback (Mn = 4.39). Optimizing people and resources and effectively monitoring the implementation of a plan were considered only slightly less useful (Mn = 4.26 and 4.19, respectively).

Participants estimated that it would be somewhat easy to apply the process management skills taught in Unit 5 in their job as an LPO (Mn = 3.49). When asked to assess the Tower Building exercise, which was the only learning activity scheduled in this unit, students responded that they felt they had learned a moderately large amount about process management skills from the exercise (Mn = 3.67), and that these skills would be of much use to them on the job as an LPO (Mn = 4.11).

The SDC observer noted that the process management subcompetencies were given little emphasis in this short unit. This finding is not in agreement with that of the participants. However, because students typically tend to be consistently favorable in their evaluations, the significance of their ratings should be interpreted with caution. Because of the nature of the Tower Building exercise, participants may have learned more about monitoring the implementation of a plan and giving feedback than about optimizing. This exercise was managed effectively, and the instructors appeared skilled in processing the activity.

About half of the respondents offered comments on Unit 5. Several positive remarks were written about the awareness and insight produced by the Tower Building exercise. One participant was able to tie several learning points together during this exercise as was evident in this comment: "I saw a dramatic need for feedback and when there was a confusing comment, 'be careful,' this hindered rather than helped. The implication is that my fear (failure anticipation) may confuse my men when I express it as a concern for 'caution' or 'be careful.' This is something I can be aware of as I monitor my efforts and the efforts of others." Suggestions received were general, having to do with the need for more specificity and time. One participant complained that the unit was "Not very informative and practical in real life situations." He did not make any specific recommendations. The observer tended to agree with these complaints. The unit was short and very general. Actually, it consisted of an introductory lecture/discussion and the Tower Building exercise. Neither of these lessons contained material specific to an LPO's duties. Finally, several participants praised the unit on process management in general terms. A typical comment was, "This unit made me look more closely at how I dealt with my own work center--recognizing my weak points and showing me how to correct them."

Unit 6.0: Problem Solving (27 and 28 February 1979). Mean responses to the questionnaire administered at the end of Unit 6 are presented in Tables B-12 and B-13. Four problem solving subcompetencies for LPOs were covered in this unit, and the participants felt that each had been emphasized to a reasonably large degree. (See Table B-12.) Each skill area was also considered to be of use to an LPO on the job. Formulating a game plan was the subcompetency perceived to have been most emphasized (Mn = 3.88) and the most useful on the job (Mn = 4.28). The skill area thought to have been emphasized the least was identifying multiple causes of a problem (Mn = 3.73). This subcompetency, however, was judged as a very useful skill for an LPO to have (Mn = 4.12). Testing assumptions and solutions was considered the least useful of the four subcompetencies (Mn = 3.88). Observer findings indicate that little emphasis was placed on any of the subcompetencies, with the exception of formulating a game plan. Each skill area was introduced at the beginning of Unit 6, but no further reference was made to them. Formulating a game plan was covered only tangentially when participants were attempting to solve the problems in the

various exercises. Attention was devoted instead to recognizing the problem and identifying promoters and restrainers important in solving the problem.

In assessing four of the five learning activities, participants were moderately positive on both dimensions. (See Table B-13.) An exception was the LANACOMCOM exercise which was given very high ratings both on amount learned ($M_n = 4.54$) and usefulness on the job ($M_n = 4.52$). This lesson was a two-hour exercise in team problem solving done in small groups. The activity with the lowest ratings was the "fat letter" analysis, which consisted of a case study and a discussion on force field analysis as a part of problem solving. Participants felt they had learned more than some about leadership and management skills from this activity ($M_n = 3.62$) and that the skills learned would be of some use to them on their jobs ($M_n = 3.46$). The SDC assessor noted that instructions for both the case study analyses and the "fat letter" analysis were vague and confusing to the participants. Therefore, students may not have learned as much useful information from these activities as they would have otherwise. The procedure for and purpose of the job opportunity role play were also unclear, thus decreasing the effectiveness of this exercise. On the other hand, the LANACOMCOM exercise was carried off very effectively, and it appeared to be an excellent opportunity for LPOs to participate in team problem solving.

Participants were also asked "How helpful do you feel what you learned about problem solving will be to you in helping solve on-the-job problems?" Responses to this question tended to be quite positive ($M_n = 4.12$). Few comments were received on Unit 6. Two participants mentioned the LANACOMCOM exercise as a beneficial activity. Another wrote that the regrouping system used for this exercise in team problem solving was very effective because "new people got a chance to vary their style of participation." The remaining comments were general praise, such as "I wish I had learned this early in my Navy career." No suggestions for change in the content or process of this unit were received.

Unit 7.0: Competency Application (1 and 2 March 1979). At the end of Unit 7, participants were asked to estimate their future use of the LMET Student Journal and to assess the learning activities used in this unit based on the

amount they learned and the usefulness of the acquired skills. Also, this instrument included a cumulative type of assessment question concerning the perceived amount learned about and the estimated usefulness of each of the 27 competency categories identified by the McBer research. These data are displayed in Tables B-14 and B-15 and summarized in the following paragraphs.

Participants felt they had learned fairly large amounts from the five learning activities included in Unit 7 and that the skills learned would be somewhat useful to very useful when they returned to their jobs. (See Table B-14.) Identifying competencies from the "Twelve O'Clock High" film appeared to be considered the most effective activity because of the large amount learned ($M_n = 4.44$) and the usefulness of the skills ($M_n = 4.48$). This activity required the entire morning of the eighth day of the course, and it involved concentration on film segments and analysis with regard to the subcompetencies. Rewriting goal statements, on the other hand, was rated the lowest on amount learned ($M_n = 3.72$) and usefulness ($M_n = 3.56$). The other activities--developing scenarios to show subcompetency skills, analyzing own job functions using optimizing grid, and using action planning forms--received similar, moderately high ratings.

Observation results show that the competency identification from the "Twelve O'Clock High" film was indeed effective. Participants enjoyed the movie and were capable of identifying many subcompetencies. The same assessment also applies to the developing scenarios activity. The students appeared to have some difficulty in rewriting the goal statements, and a thorough reiteration of the criteria was called for but not conducted. Thus, this exercise was not maximally effective. Participants seemed to gain a moderate amount of information about themselves from analyzing their job functions on the optimizing grid. The final activity, the action planning forms, was not finished by a large majority of the students. It was obvious that they were more interested in leaving the school than in concentrating on completing this assignment. After several minutes, the instructors took note of this attitude and told participants they could complete the work at their leisure.

Participants were asked to comment or make suggestions about Unit 7. Two recommendations, two general remarks, and one complaint were received. One student felt that "films like 'Twelve O'Clock High' should be used much earlier in the course to identify the competencies in relation to real life situations." Another participant suggested that the small groups be divided differently as they were in Unit 6. He wrote, "Our group was effective. I felt the need for some change, however." The observer agreed that this technique was beneficial. Unit 7 was commended because it helped a student with good criteria for setting goals and provided a helpful outline. The Personal Student Journal section was also seen as an aid. Finally, one participant wrote that this last unit "brought the course to a logical conclusion and was successful in tying up loose ends and relating all the competencies to the LPO job." The complaint about this unit was not specific: "Unit 7 should be rewritten or explained better. In its present form it's almost useless." The SDC assessor felt that Unit 7 was moderately successful in its attempt to summarize and conclude the course.

The questionnaire given at the end of this unit also included items designed to assess the course overall. Participants were asked to estimate how much they learned during the entire course about each of the competency skills and how useful each skill would be to them in the work situation. (See Table B-15.) Participants felt they had learned moderately large to very large amounts about each skill area and ratings on usefulness were medium high to very high. The two skill areas about which participants felt they had learned the most were concern for achievement and setting goals ($M_n = 4.67$ for each). Concern for achievement was also considered the skill most useful to an LPO ($M_n = 4.70$), followed by planning and organizing ($M_n = 4.67$), setting goals ($M_n = 4.65$), listening to others and understanding others ($M_n = 4.63$ for each), and influencing others and monitoring results ($M_n = 4.59$ for each). Other skills rated highly by participants on amount learned were planning and organizing ($M_n = 4.48$), taking initiative and team building ($M_n = 4.44$ for each), coaching others ($M_n = 4.42$), and listening to others and understanding others ($M_n = 4.41$ for each). The competencies in the coercion category were assigned the lowest ratings on both dimensions. Coerciveness, in particular, was felt to be the skill least learned, although the amount of knowledge acquired was still fairly large ($M_n = 3.78$). This area was also considered less useful than the others ($M_n = 3.42$). The observer found that concern for

achievement, setting goals, influencing others, listening to others, and understanding others were the areas about which a fairly large amount of information was learned. Participants appeared to learn some about concern for influence, conceptualizing a problem, rewarding others, self-control, planning and organizing, directing others, delegating responsibility to others, optimizing, monitoring results, giving feedback, helping others, positive expectations, coerciveness, negative expectations, and disciplining others. Finally, there was little evidence that the LPOs learned anything about taking initiative, coaching others, technical problem solving, team building, resolving conflicts, acting impulsively, and failing to resolve conflicts.

Many positive comments on the LPO course overall were written on this final questionnaire. The instructors were commended on their ability by several participants, and the classroom climate was praised. One student wrote, "Facilitation was very effective. The facilitators were concerned, capable, and alert. I liked their monitoring and feedback of class/group climate." This participant was referring to the climate assessment forms which were distributed by the instructors daily. Students completed the forms as the day progressed, and instructors summarized the results in terms of positive and negative climate factors at the beginning of the following day. "The most enlightening experience I have had in the Navy" and "Very good--glad I came" were typical of the favorable comments received. Other students wrote that they planned to "redirect their efforts" and improve their performance as a result of what they had learned. Several comments were written indicating that all LPOs should take this course, particularly those who were new E6's, and two students felt that all supply corps officers should be required to attend an LNET course. One participant voiced his support for the course, but also wrote "I do not feel that the major leadership problems are LPOs but more at the top rank level. We carry out orders derived by incompetent individuals. Maybe this course should have been directed towards these individuals." Finally, one participant suggested that the LPO course be expanded into a three-week program.

3.3 FINDINGS ACROSS DAYS

Participants' assessments of the course as reported at the end of each day are presented in Tables C-1 through C-4 in Appendix C. The end-of-day questionnaire administration procedure and the instrument itself are described in Section 2 of this report. Due to scheduling difficulty, data were not collected with this instrument on Day 4. To aid in data interpretation, course days are linked with dates and units in Table 3-2 below.

Table 3-2. Relationship of Course Days, Dates and Units.

Day	Date	Unit
1	20 February 1979	1.0: Introduction
2	21 February 1979	2.0: Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness
3	22 February 1979	
4	23 February 1979	
5	26 February 1979	3.0: Skillful Use of Influence
6	27 February 1979	4.0: Advising and Counseling
7	28 February 1979	5.0: Process Management
8	1 March 1979	6.0: Problem Solving
9	2 March 1979	7.0: Competency Application

Respondents were asked five basic assessment questions about the LPO Course. (See Table C-1). To the question "Overall, how did you feel about today's session of the LPO course?", a response of five indicates the student liked it very much, and a three means he liked it moderately or "so-so". Mean responses to this item were quite favorable on each day of the course. Day 2 was rated the lowest (Mn = 3.63) followed by Day 8 (Mn = 3.96), although students' attitudes were still positive. Participants liked Day 3 the most (Mn = 4.30). Day 1 was also liked more than moderately (Mn = 4.24).

The second question asked of the participants was "How easy to understand was the material covered in today's session?" A response of one indicates very easy; three, "so-so;" and five, very difficult. Participants perceived the material covered on Days 1 and 9 as being slightly easy (Mn = 2.28 and 2.67, respectively). The material covered on Day 7, although rated slightly above moderate level, was perceived as the most difficult (Mn = 3.22). The ratings for the remaining four days ranged between 2.89 and 3.04, indicating that students perceived a moderate level of difficulty.

Students were also asked "How well did the content of today's session reflect the specific duties of an LPO?" A response of five to this item indicates the content reflects an LPO's duties very well, and a three is "so-so." On the average participants felt every session was relevant to the specific duties of an LPO. Lower ratings were assigned on this item to Days 1 and 2 (Mn = 3.60 and 3.70, respectively); however, the mean response was still moderately high. Participants perceived the material covered on Days 5 and 9 as the most relevant their job responsibilities (Mn = 4.22 and 4.15, respectively).

When asked to rate the effectiveness of the instructor(s) in conveying the material presented in the daily sessions, participants were generally very positive. A response of five indicates that the instructors were very effective and three, moderately effective. The lowest instructor rating was assigned on Day 2 (Mn = 3.78). This mean response was considerably lower than ratings on this item on the other days. The instructors were perceived as the most effective on Day 3 (Mn = 4.67). On the remaining days students assigned ratings that were in the high area, the means ranging from 4.11 on Days 5 and 7 to 4.41 on Day 9.

The final general question asked of participants was about the recommendation they would give to an LPO who had not attended the course. A response of five indicates they would highly recommend the course, and three, moderately recommend it ("so-so"). The responses obtained were very favorable, and at the end of each day participants indicated they would give a strong recommendation to a peer if asked about the daily session. Mean responses ranged from 4.04 for Day 2 to 4.67 for Day 3. Day 9 was also given a high rating on this item (Mn = 4.59).

It is apparent from the questionnaire results that participants preferred Day 3 over the others, and felt that Days 2 and 1 were the least enjoyable. The SDC observer noted that participants became very involved in the afternoon activity on Day 3 (the Seabee Work Center) and enjoyed it a great deal. Thus, the overall attitude about Day 3 was very favorable and the recommendations to another LPO would have been extremely high. The lower mean rating on the overall assessment and recommendation items for Day 2 may have been at least in part due to the long hours of the day's session. Class ran until 1708 on this day, and a homework assignment was also made. A few negative comments about wasted time were overheard at the close of Day 2. In assessing course material the observer felt, contrary to participants' opinions, that Day 3 material was more difficult to understand than the other lessons. Because both managerial styles and organizational climate were introduced on this day, it appeared that participants were being slightly overloaded with cognitive information. The material presented on Day 6 also appeared to be difficult to understand for two reasons. The discussion on Navy helping resources available presented a great deal of material that would have been nearly impossible to absorb during the classroom session. Some students seemed somewhat overwhelmed by this lesson. Information delivered during the very short process management unit was so sparse that the material seemed vague and somewhat unconnected to the rest of the course. Participants felt that Day 7 lessons were more difficult to understand than the other days' material; however, the students did not appear particularly confused on this day except at one point. The lesson and activities on promoters and restrainers in problem solving was clear and straightforward, but participants may have been slightly puzzled about brainstorming as a problem solving technique. Following the Deserted Tropical Island exercise, in which students brainstormed in small groups in order to find possible uses for an object, groups presented lists which were fairly short, and it appeared that the group members were evaluating the ideas before listing them. The instructor made note of this but did not attempt to clear up the misunderstanding or confusion about the technique. Finally, Day 1 material was considered relatively easy to understand. The observer was not present on this day; however, the lesson content was generally introductory in nature and may have been less complex than material presented later in the course.

The SDC assessor agreed with course participants that the content of the lesson on Day 5 and 9 was very pertinent to the specific duties of an LPO. The Managing a New Work Center exercise on Day 5 was designed around a typical work situation, and the advising and counseling lessons also involved "real world" material. All of the activities on Day 9 had to do with applying leadership and management competencies to the LPO's job, and the students kept the content very relevant to their duties on the job. Approximately half of the material delivered in the remaining days was not specific to an LPO's situation, nor in some cases to the Navy. An example of the latter is the lesson on organizational climate which was a lecture/discussion session on climate factors supplemented by the Harvard Business School film. No connection was made between these ideas and the LPO's job. In fact, although some of the material, particularly the case studies, was well designed, neither instructors nor participants reminded each other to keep the discussion in "real world" terms. Had this been a well emphasized classroom rule, the material would surely have been more reflective of an LPO's job and of the Navy in general.

Observation findings suggest that the instructors were quite effective in conveying information covered in some lessons and inadequate at other times. The two instructors were similar in ability, and unfortunately they also tended to be weak in the same areas. Strong points were their understanding of most of the material and their obvious comfort in presenting it to a classroom full of students. Both instructors appeared to have a good grasp of most of the concepts and to be very familiar with the lesson content. For example, one instructor did an excellent job of presenting information on empowering others. His lecture was followed by a role play in which both instructors demonstrated empowering techniques. This was accomplished in a very effective manner. At all times instructors were at ease in front of the class and were very personable. Also, they worked together well as a team. The two trainers conducted all the exercises effectively, the only exception being an occasional unclear, hastily given set of instructions. The Seabee Work Center exercise was carried out very efficiently and without confusion.

For some of the small group and individual assignments, however, participants were given abrupt introductions and vague instructions, which often had to be

repeated or expanded upon. Examples of this are the advising and counseling role play assigned to pairs of students on Day 4 and the "fat letter" analysis on Day 7. At both times, participants had to ask for clarification of instructions before beginning the assignment. It is important to note that the instructors were operating under pressure to cover ten days of instruction in a nine-day course. Since apparently no material was deleted from this course, shortcuts were often necessary. However, the instructors' tendencies to rush through a lesson required that they forfeit thoroughness and flexibility to some extent. This was obvious in nearly every discussion session in which the instructor would often do such things as ignore a student's comment, ask if there were questions and then continue with the lesson without waiting for students to respond, answer questions or respond to remarks themselves without allowing other interested participants to do so, or openly negate a student's contribution. The latter mistake was made in varying degrees of seriousness. Near the beginning of the course when ground rules were discussed, the instructors asked participants to consider their contributions to the class and to avoid "making five-degree course changes" in the discussions. During the course students were often reminded of the "five-degree course change" when they made a comment similar to one that had been made previously. The idea was a good one; however, this disapproving response could have been replaced with something like, "Yes, that's similar to ...". No damage would have been done to the classroom climate, and no time would have been lost. On other occasions, participants' remarks were met by the instructors with responses like, "No, you're not seeing it right." Often no attempt was made to help the student and frustrated behavior was sometimes observed. Also, students frequently expressed a desire to answer each other's questions or to support another LPO's comments. This was rarely allowed, but it could have improved the climate significantly as well as provided instructors with some needed assistance in processing some difficult issues. To summarize, the instructors were about equal to their capability to present lesson material and to conduct group exercises. Both were weak in processing skills, however, although processing might be improved with a more relaxed schedule.

Participants' assessments of the days' learning activities are shown in Tables C-2 and C-3. Students were asked to assess both the appropriateness of time

spent on each and the amount of help each type of activity provided in their learning of the leadership and management skills. This item was worded "Several types of classroom activities were used to present material covered in today's session." To the question, "Reflecting back on events how do you feel about the amount of time spent in each type of activity?", a response of one indicates too little time; two, about the right amount of time; and three, too much time. Data was gathered each day only on those activities that were used. In general, participants felt that about the right amount of time was spent on each activity and mean responses ranged from 1.50 to 2.13. (See Table C-2.) The low mean was uncharacteristic and had to do with the amount of time spent taking tests, i.e., self-assessment instruments, during Day 1. The high mean rating indicated that participants felt a little too much time was spent on listening to a lecture on Day 3. This result is especially interesting, because a large part of the day was devoted to a film, group exercises, and the Seabee Work Center. The students also felt that not quite enough time was spent on reading during both Day 1 and Day 2, or on small group discussions on Day 2. On the second day, students discussed in small groups two case studies concerning LPO job functions. In general, participants thought a little more time should have been allowed for self-assessment instruments and reading, and a little less time in participating in group exercises.

Responses to the question, "How do you feel about how much each helped you in learning leadership and management skills?" were made on a five-point scale on which a five indicates the activity was very helpful and a three, that it was moderately helpful. Mean responses to this item ranged from 3.00 to 4.19. (See Table C-3.) Writing on Day 8 was considered only somewhat helpful ($M_n = 3.00$) and the least helpful of the activities on all days. Participants spent the morning of this day viewing segments of the "Twelve O'clock High" film and writing in their journals about the subcompetencies that were demonstrated. Also in the afternoon, the students were given the assignment of rewriting goal statements. Several comments overheard about this latter activity indicated that perhaps this was the one seen to be least helpful as compared with the others. Students felt they were helped quite a bit by the group exercise on Day 9 ($M_n = 4.19$) which was developing scenarios showing an LPO's use of leadership and management skills on the job, and by the class discussions led by the instructor on Day 2 ($M_n = 4.11$) which concerned three

social motives, achievement thinking, and processing the case studies. Overall, students considered participating in the group exercises the most helpful of the activities, and writing and reading the least helpful.

Participants were also given a list of the 27 subcompetency areas identified by the research on superior LPOs. They were asked to check each of the areas about which they learned something during that day's session. Percentages of respondents who indicated learning something about an area during each day are shown in Table C-4. Percentages for the days that the particular subcompetency area was not covered are presented in the shaded squares. The unshaded areas are for those days on which the skill was part of the lesson content, as identified by the observer's findings. The 27 subcompetencies are factored into five different categories: task achievement, skillful use of influence, management control, advising and counseling, and coercion. Overall, more participants perceived more learning in the categories of task achievement, management control, and advising and counseling than in the skillful use of influence area. The majority of participants perceived little learning in the category of coercion.

In the task achievement area, participants' perceived learning tended to be somewhat related to the lesson content. To some extent higher percentages of respondents marked learning areas on the days that the material was actually covered. On some days 100 percent was achieved. For example, every participant indicated learning something about concern for achievement on Day 3, a day devoted entirely to this area with lessons on managerial styles and organizational climate. Approximately half of the respondents felt they learned something about the task achievement skills on days in which they were not specifically addressed. On Day 3, a large majority (83%) of the respondents said they learned about technical problem solving. This area was not covered during the third day, but some of the skills practiced in the Seabee Work Center exercise may have been perceived to be technical problem solving.

Perceived learnings in the skillful use of influence areas were not as accurately on target. Influencing others, for instance, was part of the lesson on Days 4 and 5 only; however, more than half of the participants

mentioned that skill as a learning area on four other days. Also on Day 5, when the Managing a New Work Center exercise was held, only thirty percent of the respondents mentioned team building and rewarding others as learning areas. This exercise was designed to give students the opportunity to integrate the subcompetency of efficiency and effectiveness with skillful use of influence. Team building and rewarding others are important parts of the latter subcompetency. Participants' feelings about what was learned in the management control areas also did not correspond to the lesson schedule. Major discrepancies occurred on Day 3 when the Seabee Work Center was held. During this activity participants were actually directing others, delegating responsibility, optimizing, and giving feedback to a certain extent, although these skills were not scheduled to be taught. Therefore percentages of respondents considering these as learning areas were very high on Day 3. It is important to note, however, that only six participants responded to this portion of the instrument on the third day. On Day 6, less than half (44%) of the participants perceived that they had learned something about delegating responsibility to others, which was to be included in one lesson. Other perceptions in the influence area also tended to vary in accuracy.

With a few exceptions, perceived advising and counseling learnings tended to be moderately congruent with the lesson plans. Helping others and positive expectations were possibly seen as more general skills and often learning was indicated in these areas on days other than those intended in the lesson plan.

Most of the skills in the coercion category were mentioned by less than half of the participants as learning areas on each day. Because these topics were considered "negative skills" or behavior to avoid, participants may have found it difficult to determine when these subjects were covered. On Day 5, 56 percent of the respondents reported learning something about disciplining others, a subject which was included in the advising and counseling lessons. On the ninth day, however, only about one-fourth of the students responding (26%) felt they had learned something about this area, although as a part of the advising and counseling subcompetency, it was an integral part of the competency application session on Day 9.

On the end-of-day questionnaires, students were given two opportunities to make comments about each day's session. Following the scaled item concerning the type of recommendation a participant would make to another LPO, the student was asked to explain his answer by giving an example or two. The instrument was concluded with the question, "Have you any general comments about today's sessions or suggestions about how they might be improved?" Responses to these two items will be summarized together by day.

Following Day 1 most of the participants responded with favorable comments. These had to do with the informal and comfortable classroom atmosphere, the large amount of information put across in the short period of time, the need for LMST in the Navy, improvements in self-awareness, and several specific learning areas. One student suggested that there be more group discussions. Another respondent wrote that he felt everyone should have a chance to express ideas whenever necessary.

In assessing Day 2, participants wrote several positive comments. Remarks about the course as a growth experience and an opportunity for self-assessment were prevalent. Specific comments concerned the benefits gained from the goal setting lesson and the Target Practice exercise. Several participants wrote complaints about this day. These were concerning poor instructions to exercises, the lack of meaning of the "ring tossing," dragging and boring lecture presentations, question/answer sessions which were dominated by only a few individuals, and general confusion at the vast amount of material. A few respondents complained about poor scheduling and long hours. One student suggested that after the case studies were discussed in terms of categories of achievement thinking, "a training aid should have been displayed to show how the proper symbols were definite answers."

Fewer comments were received on Day 3. Students who were favorable wrote about the "excellent examples of how leadership positions are supposed to be used correctly," the help provided by the exercises in changing managerial style, and the Seabee Work Center. One participant mentioned that he liked having the instructors teach the class instead of participating himself, and he hoped this would continue. Two complaints were received concerning drawn

out discussions in which the instructors asked for too many examples for the same point. Two others suggested that the Harvard Business School film be updated.

On Day 5, positive comments had to do with the need for advising and counseling in the Navy. One student wrote that this skill, used properly or improperly, could make or break a division. The videotape was also praised as a good instructional aid. To improve the course, one respondent felt that learning objectives should be given to the students before a lesson is started. Two students wanted less classroom participation and more formal instruction. Also, the instructors were criticized for being unclear and "too technical." Role playing was mentioned frequently. One student felt everyone should have been involved in this activity, another thought there should be more of it along with self-assessment, and a third considered role playing ineffective for him because of his "learning style--probably due to my shyness (stage fright)." Finally, a respondent suggested that brainstorming be given less time and that "valid information" be used instead.

All but one comment received on Day 6 were favorable. Participants praised "The Dryden File" film, the Tower Building exercise, the classroom climate, the problem solving formula, the information on Navy resources, and their observation of and involvement in using skills. Suggestions were made about the need for more examples and the benefit of re-emphasizing subcompetencies following an exercise: "Something definitely happens during an exercise and by coupling the idea that one or more definite subcompetencies have been met or have occurred will secure new observations more solidly into the matrix of previous material." Finally, two complaints about the length of the day were received.

Following Day 7 participants wrote that they enjoyed the LANACOMCOM exercise and that the exercises and lectures were very helpful. In addition to other more general favorable comments, complaints were written about material seeming dry, the class being too large for real participation, and the day being a "shallow" one. One student suggested a more in-depth and realistic exercise in brainstorming involving more factors than the Deserted Tropical Island exercise. His example was "six people who get stranded (washed ashore)

with routine items usually found in a person's pocket. Disclosure, initiative, skillful use of influence, and team building would dramatically increase."

The "Twelve O'Clock High" film was described on Day 8 by several participants as a very helpful learning activity. A few students made suggestions about the film. One thought the scene analysis should be written on the chalk board, and another thought either the film should be shorter or that each group should analyze the behavior of only one character. One student considered the atmosphere of the class on Day 8 to be teamlike and that the feedback and insightful comments allowed for some effective self-assessment. Day 8 lessons were also seen as a good overview for the subcompetencies.

A small number of comments were written on the Day 9 questionnaire, and the majority were very positive. Participants felt the course was helpful and thorough, and that the instructors were very effective. One student mentioned the value of identifying subcompetencies by giving feedback to the other participants during classroom activities. Another respondent wrote that the course helped him see problems that were not always clear on the job. Self-awareness and practice in goal setting skills were seen as two major gains made as a result of the day's training. One participant complained that there was too much time spent on group discussion, and another suggested that the training be expanded into a three-week course.

3.4 FINDINGS ACROSS WEEKS

Measured data gathered by the course overview questionnaires are presented in Table 3-3. This instrument was administered in the afternoon of Friday of the first week (23 February 1979) and in the morning of Friday of the second week of the course (2 March 1979). Questions asked were general evaluation items designed to provide a cumulative assessment of the course. For the most part, students were somewhat more favorable about the course toward the end of Week 2 than at the end of Week 1; however, all assessment ratings at both response times were moderately high to very high. Participants considered overall course effectiveness to be high at both times. By the end of Week 2, course

Table 3-3. Overall Course Evaluation as Reported by Participants
Near the End of Each Week (Means).

Question	Mean Response	
	Week 1	Week 2
• Overall, how would you rate this course as to effectiveness in training leadership and management skills?	4.30	4.37
• To what extent do the course objectives address issues or problems important to the Navy?	4.04	4.22
• In general, how well do you feel course objectives have been met?	4.07	4.30
• How well has this course met your expectations?	4.30	4.41
• How much have you learned from other participants during the course so far?	3.96	4.04
• How do you feel about attending this course?	4.48	4.48
• How effective do you feel the <u>methods</u> used in this course are in getting the instructional points across?	4.22	4.52
• In your opinion, how capable are the <u>instructor(s)</u> in using these methods to get the instructional points across?	4.56	4.52

objectives were perceived as addressing Navy relevant issues to a slightly greater extent than was judged at the end of Week 1. A similar increase was evident from the first to the second week in participants' assessments of how well course objectives had been met. Students' expectations of the course were well met at both times, although this rating was slightly better at the end of the second week. Also at both periods, participants felt they had learned quite a bit from others and they liked attending the LPO course a great deal. The instructional methods were rated high at the end of Week 1 on effectiveness in getting points across and very high on the same characteristic at the end of Week 2. The instructors received an extremely favorable evaluation on each week, although this rating was the only one which was even slightly lower at the time of the later assessment.

Again, it is important to note the general tendency of participants in a course of this type to respond favorably to evaluation questions. Observation findings do not support student's opinions in all cases. The SDC assessor found the LMET LPO course to be only moderately effective in training leadership and management skills. The major emphasis of the course was on cognitive content. Thus, skill practice was not given attention sufficient to train LPOs effectively in the subcompetency areas. An example of this problem occurred during Unit 2 which was intended to teach students eight subcompetency skills. Only one opportunity for actual practice of these skills was allowed. This was the Seabee Work Center exercise during which one participant who was the work center manager in each of the four groups was able to practice taking personal responsibility to solve problems, learning the job in order to accomplish tasks or brief others, being cooperative and promoting cooperation, looking for ways to improve work, and monitoring others' performance. The manager and the remaining participants were to some extent both able to set goals and use performance standards during this activity and in the Target Practice exercise; however, because the situations were not all similar to those found on an LPO's job, this activity had the effect of a demonstration rather than training in job skills. No opportunity was scheduled for participants to try to sharpen their skills of recognizing when others achieve a quality standard or informing the chain of command.

The objectives of this course were not printed in either the Student Journal or the Instructor Guide. Participants were not informed of the unit objectives and only occasionally were the objectives of a lesson mentioned

before it was started. A large part of the course material was relevant to Navy issues; however, some of the concepts presented were illustrated solely by civilian work situations.

The observer noted that participants tended not to interact with each other during classroom discussions, primarily because this was not encouraged by the instructors and in most cases, was not allowed to take place. During breaks and informal group discussions, however, the students shared experiences with their peers, often in light of what they were learning about leadership in the course. Therefore, participants may have learned a great deal from each other, but only as a result of being at the same place at the same time in this type of environment, and not in the classroom itself. Over the two weeks, the observer had a chance to speak informally with most of the participants. It was clear that they enjoyed the course and felt that they were gaining something by attending.

The instructional methods appeared to be quite effective, and there was a comfortable balance between the types of learning activities. Only two self-assessment instruments were used during this course. The use of the Learning Style Inventory was not observed, but the Motivational Style Questionnaire was administered, explained, and discussed in an effective manner. Instructor capabilities were discussed earlier in this report. Participants rated their effectiveness slightly lower at the end of Week 2, possibly because of the effects the tight schedule may have had on their behavior. During the second week, the classroom atmosphere was somewhat relaxed and lessons tended to be rushed.

The Student Journal, with some exceptions, was adequate for the needs of the participants and was well organized. Each section was introduced with a short paragraph describing the content of the unit, followed by a table of contents. For most of the major topics, lecture outlines and notes were included. Case studies and other activities were followed by short instructions and worksheets on which students were to fill in blanks. Although the introduction section included a one-page presentation of the "LMET Course Training Goals," the specific objectives of each unit were neither printed in the Student Journal nor mentioned in the classroom. The

overall goals of the course were presented as recognition, understanding, self-assessment and goal setting, skill training, and performance of the skills and behaviors. Finally, pages in the Student Journal were occasionally found out of proper sequence and some reading material was not used or even referred to during the course.

The videotape on advising and counseling shown during Unit 4 was an excellent learning aid and was extremely relevant to an LPO's work situation. "The Caine Mutiny" film excerpt and the "Twelve O'Clock High" movie were very pertinent to military leadership issues and were effective learning activities. The Harvard Business School film on organizational climate was difficult for participants to relate to because of its age and its orientation toward profit making civilian organizations. This film did, however, clearly demonstrate the climate factors covered in the preceding lesson. In spite of the fact that "The Dryden File" film concerned a civilian counseling and referral situation, participants seemed familiar with the issues and they appeared to gain some insight and knowledge as a result of this film.

The instructors also made use of newsprint charts to assist them in their presentations. Some of these had been created prior to the lesson, and others were written in front of the class and were made up of participants' responses to discussion questions. The content of these charts was appropriate and helpful, but effectiveness would have been improved if the charts were printed more legibly and more care were taken with correct spelling and meaningful abbreviations.

There was no Instructor Guide to speak of. The only material used by the instructors was the LMET LPO Supplement, subtitled "Outline for Revision of LPO Instructor Guide." Learning activities were outlined in this supplement and notes were written on specific points to be emphasized. Reference was occasionally made to the "IG" (Instructor Guide); however, the instructors did not use an IG and one was not made available to the SDC assessor. The outline used during this course could not be used as the sole training guide, but it appeared to be adequate for the instructors of this LPO course as a supplement to their own experience as LMET instructors. Because of the sketchy manner in which the outline was written, it was difficult to ascertain the degree to

which instructors followed this guide. A training schedule was printed specifically for the nine-day course, and with the exception of small time variations, the process of instruction deviated from the schedule only once. This change occurred on Day 6 during Unit 5 when a 45-minute lesson on optimizing people and resources ("Time of Your Life") was not presented. The lesson was marked "optional" on the schedule, but according to the instructors, McBer staff members and Navy instructors had decided that this presentation was not to be made in either a nine-day or ten-day LPO course. There was no other evidence that revisions to the course material in addition to what had been added by the LPO Supplement, were being made as the course progressed.

SECTION 4 - INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The results of this assessment relative to the three evaluation objectives are interpreted in this section. Conclusions drawn from the findings relative to course delivery and to training materials are presented. Finally, recommendations are made based upon these conclusions.

4.2 DISCUSSION

As described in Section 3 of this report, observer findings were generally supportive of participants' assessments. Summarized interpretation of these results is discussed in terms of course delivery and the training materials.

4.2.1 COURSE DELIVERY

The effectiveness of the LPO course delivery was uneven. Lecture/discussion sessions were generally very good, although effectiveness was high primarily for those lessons which were supported by additional activity. The supplemental learning activities gave students the chance to incorporate the material with previously learned concepts and to receive feedback and help on their understanding of the lesson content. When this additional training did not take place, students did not appear to absorb the material well. This was evidenced occasionally during later lessons when reference was made to previously introduced material. Exercises also were well conducted, with a few exceptions occurring when the instructors seemed to be attempting to meet deadlines and they gave only cursory explanations and instructions. Participants' complaints about some of the exercises being meaningless may have been due at least somewhat to confusion as a result of the exercises being insufficiently explained.

The classroom climate was adequate but far from optimal. Participants did not appear to feel completely free to express themselves, and although the instructors were occasionally supportive, their behavior was unpredictable. Therefore, the classroom atmosphere was potentially threatening and less than ideal.

The major flaw in the course delivery had to do with the processing of learning activities. During a few discussions the instructors were very perceptive and were able to offer some interesting and pertinent insights. But at all times both instructors lacked flexibility in their discussion leadership, and on some occasions they were entirely too rigid. When faced with a question or a disagreeing remark, their response was often to repeat the concept definition word-for-word as it was printed in the Student Journal. Also, although the instructors frequently called upon each other for support, they failed to utilize the knowledge and experience available in the classroom. Participants were not encouraged to answer another's question or to elaborate upon a point when the instructor considered the particular part of the discussion closed. This problem was, of course, related to the climate issue. Both these deficiencies may not exist to this degree during a course in which time is not a major concern.

The data show that the amount participants gained from the course varied with instructional unit and with learning activities within a unit. The second unit on efficiency and effectiveness was one in which most of the lecture sessions were augmented by other activities and several of the skills were practiced during group exercises. Participants seemed to acquire several useful skills from this unit. The third unit, which concerned the skillful use of influence, was one of the least effective. Although lessons included supporting activities, lecture presentations were weak in this unit and skill practice was minimal. Growth in the influence areas may have been limited partially because of the classroom climate. Students may have felt non-influential when they were kept from making a contribution to a discussion, and the instructors failed to empower the participants. The advising and counseling unit was somewhat more effective because the LPOs were able to practice, to some extent, good counseling behavior and to receive feedback on their performance. However, the unit would be improved if exercises involving

performance analysis and referral decisions were added, providing that these areas are considered learning objectives. The fifth unit was inadequate in teaching process management skills. First, the unit was too short and contained only one lecture/discussion session and one exercise. These learning activities would be sufficient for introductory material; however, this unit, if it is to be a part of the course, should be expanded. Participants seemed to learn some from the problem solving unit, but because the subcompetency skills were not taught directly, gains were low in these areas. The material in this unit did not link the learning points to the four problem solving subcompetencies. The final unit concerning the integration and applications of the subcompetencies taught throughout the course was adequate to the extent that the lessons provided a summary of the material and an opportunity for students to incorporate what they had learned into an overall conception of superior leadership and management. Again, however, participants did not practice the subcompetencies and thus, received no feedback regarding their leadership skills.

4.2.2 COURSE MATERIALS

As discussed in Section 3 of this report, the Student Journal was a useful tool for participants. Case studies were well written, and for the most part, the content was relevant to an LPO's duties on the job. Learning objectives specific to each unit were not printed in the Student Journal, and the reading and writing material was not in proper sequence. Some of the films were acceptable and others were excellent learning aids. The videotape was outstanding. The newsprint outlines that were posted were adequate in assisting students. The instructors did not use a formal Instructor Guide but followed a supplement, which had been handwritten by MoBer personnel and reproduced. There was no evidence that other revisions were made in the course material at the local level. The LPO supplement consisted of a rough outline of the course and very informal notes on presentation content. Unit objectives were not included.

SECTION 5 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Conclusions and recommendations concerning the assessment objectives of the LMET LPO course are presented in this section. The basis for the conclusions is documented by reference to the preceding sections of this report.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

The first evaluation objective was to provide an assessment of the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to effectively teach/deliver the LMET LPO course in compliance with course objectives. The following conclusions concern this objective:

1. The LPO course participants appeared to enjoy the training a great deal and considered it to be useful (3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4). Their attitude can be attributed at least in part to the environment which was created by the gathering in one place of people in similar positions and with similar experiences (3.4).
2. With some exceptions, the Navy instructors were found to be effective in presenting course content through lectures and conducting group exercises (3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4). Delivery was less effective when occasional lecture sessions were rushed because of tight time constraints and when explanations and instructions for a few of the group exercises were poorly given (3.2.2, 3.3).
3. Although the Navy instructors' processing behavior varied, it was found to be generally ineffective and often too rigid (3.2.2, 3.3). Also, the climate in the classroom ranged from fair to poor. The most significant deficiency was the absence of care taken to insure that students felt free to speak and were responded to in a non-pejorative manner (3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4).

4. The amount of material to be covered and the number of learning activities scheduled appeared to be at least somewhat excessive for a ten-day course and extremely so for the allotted time of nine days. It appeared that the time constraint may have contributed to some of the deficiencies in areas such as classroom climate and processing effectiveness (3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4).
5. The enabling objectives of the LPO course were neither presented in any written material used in the course nor mentioned in the classroom (3.4).
6. The LPO course content and process were found to be oriented toward the acquisition of knowledge. The development and improvement of subcompetency skills was given inadequate attention (3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.4).
7. Participants seemed to understand much of the course content. However, there was apparently some confusion about the material which was hurriedly delivered and/or inadequately processed (3.2.2, 3.3).
8. With some exceptions, the instructional methods used in the LPO course were found to be effective, and the balance between the various types of scheduled activities appeared to be comfortable for participants and instructors. However, only a few lessons concerning subcompetency skills included a skill practice activity in which students were able to use the effective behavior and to receive feedback on their skill performance (3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.4).
9. Participants' knowledge acquisition level appeared to range from poor to very good. The amount learned seemed to be greater in those units which were allotted more time, such as Unit 2. The shorter units, such as Unit 5, did not seem to deliver a great deal of information to the participants (3.2.1, 3.2.2).

10. The level of participants' skill acquisition appeared to range from very poor to adequate. Students seemed to develop or improve skills to a greater degree during the units which included some adequate skill practice activities, as did Unit 4 (3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.4).
11. A large part of the course content was found to be relevant to Navy issues and LPO job responsibilities. This included most of the readings and lectures, a few of the films, and the videotape. Some of the films and readings, however, were couched in a civilian setting. Participants appeared to have difficulty relating to course material which did not pertain to their work situation (3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4).

The second evaluation objective concerned the adequacy of course materials as they affected delivery, and the evaluation of local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial offering of the course. The following conclusions pertain to this objective:

1. Participants appeared to benefit from the outlines, notes, readings, and worksheets in the Student Journal, and material in this manual was found to be relevant to an LPO's job responsibilities. The enabling objectives were omitted from the Student Journal, and some of the material was out of sequence (3.4).
2. Students seemed to enjoy the self-assessment instruments. The administration of the Learning Style Inventory was not observed. Although the Motivational Style Inventory was not interpreted thoroughly, it was used adequately as an introduction to the topic of managerial styles (3.2.2, 3.4).
3. Films and the videotape seemed to be effective, and in general they were found to be somewhat relevant to the duties of an LPO. Films taken from civilian sources were the least relevant and this tended to detract from their effectiveness (3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4). Posted charts were adequate for use as learning aids although improvements in legibility and accuracy were needed (3.4).

4. The Instructor Guide consisted of a handwritten set of notes designed to supplement the original guide as a revision. When used as the instructors' only manual, as it was used in this course, this supplement is adequate (3.4).
5. There was no indication that the LPO supplement was being modified during the course (3.4).

The third evaluation objective was to provide specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the LPO course. Data collected from only one LPO class is insufficient for the determination of conclusions concerning this objective. Only two LMET instructors were observed during this course and complete information on their educational backgrounds and teaching experience was not provided to SDC. Background and performance data gathered systematically from an adequate sample of courses and instructors must be analyzed carefully in order to make the type of assessment required by the third evaluation objective. It was concluded, however, that Navy instructors need to achieve an adequate proficiency level in all areas covered in instructor training, including group facilitation training, and to maintain this level when in the classroom. This is required to insure that there are no areas of weakness reflected in the performance of their instructional responsibilities (3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4).

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

1. Implementation of the overall design of the LMET LPO course should be continued and this training should be made available to all LPOs in the Navy.
2. Navy instructors should receive additional training in group facilitation in order to improve their processing skills and their ability to set and maintain a favorable classroom climate. Consideration should be given to increasing the emphasis on group facilitation skills in the LMET-I course and to providing a separate course in group processing to be administered to LMET instructors as part of their initial on-the-job-training.

3. The LPO course curriculum should be examined with regard to the possibility of decreasing the amount of material and increasing the amount of time and number of skill-building activities allotted for each content area. Also, LPO course content should be compared overall with the LMET objectives and modifications made to bring the LPO course better in line with LMET objectives. A shift from the focus on cognitive learning to skill performance is recommended. Much of the material on conceptual models and leadership theories should be deleted from the curriculum. The defined subcompetency skills should be more heavily emphasized both through lecture/discussion sessions and skill practice activities.
4. Participants should be informed of the terminal objectives for the LPO course and of the enabling objectives specific to each unit of instruction. This should be accomplished both verbally in the classroom, allowing for discussion, and in the Student Journal.
5. Course material drawn from civilian business sources and left unmodified should be redesigned to reflect Navy issues and the specific job responsibilities of LPOs. Consideration should be given to the possibility of developing Navy materials which present content that is similar to that in the civilian-produced learning aids but which is in a context relevant to the Navy. The lessons on organizational climate and performance counseling, among others, could be improved if the Harvard Business School Film and "The Dryden File" Film were replaced with new Navy learning aids on the same topic. Consideration should be given to including a description and discussion of the HRM Survey in the curriculum.
6. The LPO Student Journal should be reorganized to conform to the course schedule and to include terminal and enabling objectives.

7. An updated version of the LMET LPO Instructor Guide that reflects course revisions should be produced and implemented in the course as soon as possible. Specific instructions about how to shorten the course, if necessary, should be provided. Subsequent revisions should be approved, distributed, and printed in the Instructor Guide as soon as they are made. All LPO course instructors should use the same version of the Instructor Guide.
8. The Navy should take positive action steps to ensure that the knowledge base and instructional skills of Navy instructors in the LMET program have reached criterion in all areas before instructors enter the classroom and that these skills are maintained to criterion thereafter. More emphasis on measuring the effectiveness with which LMET content and group facilitation skills are mastered should be incorporated in the training of LMET instructors. Standardized techniques for measuring the proficiency of LMET instructors in the job setting should be developed and implemented as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A
LMET LPO COURSE SCHEDULE
FEBRUARY/MARCH 1979

LMET LPO COURSE SCHEDULE - FEBRUARY/MARCH 1979

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
Tuesday* 20 Feb 79			
0800-0845	1.0	Administrative remarks and student introductions	Lecture/discussion
0900-0945		Course introduction	Lecture/discussion
1000-1100		Course expectations	Lecture/discussion, writing, group exercise
1115-1145		Learning styles	Self-assessment instrument
1300-1400		Learning styles	Lecture/discussion, group exercise
1410-1430	2.0	Introduction to concern for efficiency and effectiveness	Lecture/discussion
1440-1530		Efficiency and effectiveness case studies	Reading (case studies), writing, group exercise
1540-1620		Definition of efficiency and effectiveness	Lecture/discussion
Homework		Efficiency and effectiveness subcompetencies	Reading, writing
Wednesday 21 Feb 79			
0800-0826		SDC assessment	Form 1 (End-of-Unit 1.0) and Form 10 (End-of-Day)
0840-0851		Climate assessment summary; review and preview	
0851-0901		Administration	Address by HRMS Department Head
0901-0949		Efficiency and effectiveness subcompetencies (review of homework assignment)	Discussion
1005-1045		Three social motives	Lecture/discussion
1100-1200 and 1300-1400		Categories of achievement thinking	Lecture/discussion, reading (case studies), writing

* Times for Day 1 are approximate.

LMET LPO COURSE SCHEDULE - FEBRUARY/MARCH 1979 (Cont'd)

PERIOD	UNIT	TOPIC	LEARNING ACTIVITY
1400-1521	2.0	Achievement behavior and LPO job	Reading (case studies), writing, group exercise, discussion
1521-1708	(cont.)	Target Practice Exercise	Exercise, discussion
Homework		Motivational Style Questionnaire	Self-assessment instrument
Thursday 22 Feb 79			
0800-0810	2.0	Climate assessment summary	Form 10 (End-of-Day)
0810-0819	(cont.)	SDC assessment	Lecture/discussion
0835-0845		Review and preview	Lecture/discussion, film, reading, writing
0855-0940		Managerial styles	Exercise, discussion
0956-1150		Organizational climate	Form 2 (End-of-Unit 2.0)
1300-1620		Seabee Work Center	
1620-1636		SDC assessment	
Friday 23 Feb 79			
0800-0810		SDC assessment	Form 10 (End-of-Day)
0810-0825		Climate assessment summary;	
0837-0945	3.0	review and preview	Lecture/discussion, reading (case studies), writing
0958-1112		Introduction to skillful use of influence	Lecture/discussion, role plays, group exercise
1120-1205		Empowering others	Group exercise, lecture/discussion
1305-1404		Rewards and recognition	Lecture/discussion, film
1416-1533		Emotional self-control	Exercise, discussion
1533-1547		Exercise in personal influence	Form 20 (Course Overview)
Homework		SDC assessment	Reading
		Motives, managerial styles, and organizational climate	

LMET LPO COURSE SCHEDULE - FEBRUARY/MARCH 1979 (Cont'd)

PERIOD	UNIT	TOPIC	LEARNING ACTIVITY
0800-0812	3.0	Climate assessment summary;	
0819-1045	(cont.)	preview and review integrating efficiency and effectiveness and skillful use of influence--managing a new work center	Exercise, discussion
1045-1053	4.0	SDC assessment	Form 3 (End-of-Unit 3.0)
1107-1215		Introduction to advising and counseling	Lecture/discussion, videotaped case study, reading, writing
1320-1555		Four types of counseling	Lecture/discussion, group exercise, role plays
Tuesday 27 Feb 79			
0800-0812	4.0	SDC assessment	Form 10 (End-of-Day)
0818-0838	(cont.)	Climate assessment summary; review and preview	
0847-1145		Navy helping resources available	Lecture/discussion, film, reading, writing
1145-1155	5.0	SDC assessment	Form 4 (End-of-Unit 4.0)
1305-1340		Introduction to process management/ problem solving	Lecture/discussion
1350-1525		Tower Building Exercise	Exercise, writing, discussion
1525-1535		SDC assessment	Form 5 (End-of-Unit 5.0)
1535-1620	6.0	Introduction to problem solving	Lecture/discussion, reading (case studies), writing
Wednesday 28 Feb 79			
0800-0812		SDC assessment	Form 10 (End-of-Day)
0820-0828		Climate assessment summary; review and preview	
0828-1112	6.0	Problem variables and forces	Lecture/discussion, reading, writing (case studies), role plays, group exercise
	(cont.)		

LMET LPO COURSE SCHEDULE - FEBRUARY/MARCH 1979 (Cont'd)

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
1118-1142 and 1320-1348 1355-1600 1600-1610	6.0 (cont.)	Brainstorming	Lecture/discussion, group exercise
		Team problem solving: "LANACOMCOM"	Lecture/discussion, group exercise
		SDC assessment	Form 6 (End-of-Unit 6.0)
Thursday 1 Mar 79			
0800-0811 0815-0831		SDC assessment Climate assessment summary; review and preview	Form 10 (End-of-Day)
0840-1225 1400-1422	7.0	Identifying competency application Introduction to goal setting and action planning	Film, reading, writing, discussion Lecture/discussion
1422-1600 1600		Goal setting SDC assessment	Writing, discussion Form 10 (End-of-Day)
Friday 2 Mar 79			
0800-0808 0808-0813		SDC assessment Climate assessment summary; review and preview	Form 20 (course overview)
0820-1020	7.0 (cont.)	Applications of competencies to LPO job functions	Group exercises, lecture/discussion, writing
1037-1138 1152-1214 1214-1220 1220-1235		Self-assessment Goal setting/action planning Closing remarks SDC assessments	Lecture/discussion, writing, reading Discussion, writing Form 10 (End-of-Day) and Form 7 (End-of-Unit 7.0)
1235		<u>Graduation</u>	

APPENDIX B

END-OF-UNIT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Table B-1. Participant Perceptions
of Introductory Knowledge Areas.
(Means)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered several areas as ground-work for the LPO course. In the box below, please indicate how much you feel you <u>learned</u> about each area and how <u>helpful</u> this information is to you as preparation for the LPO course. 	Amount Learned	Help in Course Preparation
Competency-based research	3.75	3.37
Adult learning model	4.08	3.64
Learning styles	4.38	4.12
Reasons for change from LMT to LMET	3.63	3.36
LMET course training objectives	3.92	3.85
Course expectations	3.77	3.73

Table B-2. Participant Perceptions of
Efficiency and Effectiveness Knowledge Areas.
(Means)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you on your job as an LPO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Three social motives	4.26	4.22
Categories of achievement thinking	4.00	3.93
Organizational climate	4.15	3.89
Specific behaviors of effective and ineffective LPOs	4.22	4.07

Table B-3. Participant Perceptions of Efficiency and Effectiveness Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered eight subcompetencies of efficiency and effectiveness. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Has concern/ability to set goals and use performance standards	3.70	4.19
Recognizes when others achieve a quality standard	3.63	4.04
Takes personal responsibility for immediate action to solve problems	3.63	4.11
Learns job functions, procedures, and rationale needed to accomplish tasks or brief others	3.81	4.33
Is cooperative and promotes cooperation to increase productivity	4.07	4.52
Looks for ways to improve work	4.00	4.59
Monitors own and others' performance judiciously	3.78	4.11
Informs chain of command	3.67	4.04

Table B-4. Participant Perceptions of Efficiency and Effectiveness Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. In the box below, please indicate how much you feel you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each, and how useful the skills will be to you in the job as an LPO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Case studies	3.88	3.70
Target Practice exercise	3.50	3.19
Motivational Styles Questionnaire	4.04	3.67
Harvard Business School film	3.31	3.26
Seabee Work Center	4.15	4.15

Table B-5. Participant Perceptions of Skillful Use of Influence Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you on your job as an LPO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Categories of power thinking	3.96	3.74
Specific behaviors of influential and non-influential LPOs	4.35	3.85
Importance of emotional self control	4.46	4.59

Table B-6. Participant Perceptions of Skillful Use of Influence Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered eight subcompetencies of skillful use of influence. How much emphasis do you feel the course placed on each competency area and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Appropriately uses authoritarian control to reach unit objectives	3.77	3.78
Sets and communicates limits for individual's behavior	3.63	3.81
Possesses realistic limitations of own sphere of influence	3.70	3.85
Faces conflict honestly but tactfully	3.78	4.00
Mediates or advocates someone else's position	3.56	3.74
Attempts to convince others	4.07	4.19
Motivates people to work by use of rewards	3.74	4.00
Practices emotional self-control when dealing with conflict	4.26	4.52

Table B-7. Participant Perceptions of Skillful Use of Influence Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Case studies	3.58	3.67
Role plays	3.89	4.00
Managing a new work center exercise	3.84	3.92
"Caine Mutiny" film excerpt	4.11	3.89
Welfare and recreation award exercise in personal influence	3.85	3.56

Table B-8. Participant Perceptions of Advising and Counseling Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Four types of counseling	4.15	4.22
Navy helping resources available	4.19	4.04
Referral Decision Guidelines	4.31	4.22
Performance analysis	4.27	4.30

Table B-9. Participant Perceptions of Advising and Counseling Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered subcompetencies of advising and counseling. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Demonstrates positive concern	3.88	4.00
Shows genuine interest	3.85	4.11
Understands others	3.81	4.15
Seeks out persons with problems	3.69	4.07
Establishes rapport	4.00	4.07
Listens to others	4.23	4.30
Accurately hears the problem	4.31	4.44
Suggests and clarifies alternatives	4.12	4.30

Table B-10. Participant Perceptions of Advising and Counseling Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Videotape analysis	4.16	4.12
Role plays	3.56	3.69
"Dryden File" film	4.08	4.23

Table B-11. Participant Perceptions of Process Management Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covers three subcompetencies of process management. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Optimizes people and resources	3.88	4.26
Effectively monitors the implementation of a plan	3.81	4.19
Gives effective performance feedback	3.88	4.39

Table B-12. Participant Perceptions of Problem Solving Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered four subcompetencies of problem solving. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as an LPO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Identifies multiple causes of problems	3.73	4.12
Formulates a game plan	3.88	4.28
Tests assumptions and solutions	3.81	3.88
Decides when to delegate and when to ask for help	3.85	4.00

Table B-13. Participant Perceptions of Problem Solving Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as an LPO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Case studies	3.89	3.84
"Fat letter" analysis	3.62	3.46
Job opportunity role play	3.67	3.74
Deserted island brainstorm	3.84	3.72
LANACOMCOM exercise	4.54	4.52

Table B-14. Participant Perceptions of Competency Application Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as an LPO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Competency identification from "Twelve O'Clock High" film	4.44	4.48
Rewriting goal statements	3.72	3.56
Developing scenarios	3.88	3.73
Analysis of own job functions using optimizing grid	4.00	4.04
Use of action planning forms	4.04	3.96

Table B-15. Participant Perceptions of LPO Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LMET LPO course is designed to increase your ability to perform a variety of competency skills important for effective leadership and management. Reflecting back over the entire course, how much do you feel you learned about each skill listed below, and how useful will the skills learned be to you on the job as an LPO? 		Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Task Achievement	Concern for achievement	4.67	4.70
	Taking initiative	4.44	4.50
	Setting goals	4.67	4.65
	Coaching others	4.42	4.54
	Technical problem solving	4.07	4.26
Skillful Use of Influence	Concern for influence	4.33	4.44
	Influencing others	4.33	4.59
	Conceptualizing a problem	4.11	4.15
	Team building	4.44	4.48
	Rewarding others	4.07	4.22
	Self-control	4.23	4.54
Management Control	Planning and organizing	4.48	4.67
	Directing others	4.19	4.48
	Delegating responsibility to others	4.15	4.37
	Optimizing (people-tasks)	4.00	4.50
	Monitoring results	4.30	4.59
	Resolving conflicts	4.08	4.26
	Giving feedback	4.19	4.33

Table B-15. Participant Perceptions of LPO
Skill Areas (Means). (Cont'd)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LMET LPO course is designed to increase your ability to perform a variety of competency skills important for effective leadership and management. Reflecting back over the entire course, how much do you feel you learned about each skill listed below, and how useful will the skills learned be to you on the job as an LPO? 		Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Advising and Counseling	Listening to others	4.41	4.63
	Understanding others	4.41	4.63
	Helping others	4.26	4.48
	Positive expectations	4.19	4.41
Coercion	Coerciveness	3.78	3.42
	Negative expectations	3.85	3.54
	Disciplining others	3.92	4.00
	Acting impulsively	3.89	3.50
	Failing to resolve conflicts	3.96	3.58

APPENDIX C
END-OF-DAY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Table C-1. Participant Assessments of the Course
as Reported Daily (Means).

Question	Time of Response								
	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	
● Overall, how did you feel about today's session of the LPO course?	4.24	3.63	4.30	4.07	4.15	4.19	3.96	4.00	
● How easy to understand was the material covered in today's session?	2.28	2.96	2.96	3.00	3.04	3.22	2.89	2.67	
● How well did the content of today's session reflect the specific duties of an LPO?	3.60	3.70	3.85	4.22	4.04	3.93	3.81	4.15	
● In your opinion, how effective were the instructor(s) in conveying the material presented in today's session?	4.19	3.78	4.67	4.11	4.15	4.11	4.33	4.41	
● What kind of a recommendation would you give if an LPO who had not attended this course asked you about today's session?	4.42	4.04	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.26	4.59	

Table C-2. Participant Assessments of Appropriateness of Time Spent in Various Activities (Means).

• Several types of classroom activities were used to present material covered in today's session. Reflecting back on events, how do you feel about the amount of time spent in each type of activity?	Time of Response								
	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	
a. Listening to a lecture	2.00	2.04	2.13	2.00	2.00	1.96	2.00	1.96	
b. Class discussion led by instructor	2.04	1.96	1.93	2.00	2.07	1.96	2.00	2.00	
c. Small group discussion	2.04	1.77	2.00	2.07	2.00	2.07	1.84	2.00	
d. Reading (LMET Journal, etc.)	1.68	1.72	1.88	1.88	1.91	2.00	1.95	1.91	
e. Participating in group exercises	2.04	2.04	1.96	2.11	2.04	2.11	*	2.00	
f. Writing	1.95	1.95	1.85	1.90	1.88	1.95	2.00	2.09	
g. Taking tests (Self-assessment instruments)	1.50	2.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	
h. Viewing films	*	*	1.95	1.87	2.00	*	2.08	*	
i. Writing in Student Personal Journal	2.09	1.85	1.96	1.93	1.93	2.04	1.95	2.08	

* Activity did not take place.

Table C-3. Participant Assessments of Helpfulness of Various Activities in Learning Leadership Skills (Means).

● Several types of classroom activities were used to present material covered in today's session. Reflecting back on events, how do you feel about how much each helped you in learning leadership and management skills?	Time of Response								
	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	
a. Listening to a lecture	3.81	3.77	3.70	3.76	3.71	3.57	3.87	3.88	
b. Class discussion led by instructor	4.04	4.11	3.81	3.70	3.81	3.93	3.96	4.07	
c. Small group discussion	3.69	3.50	3.93	3.63	3.96	3.96	3.16	4.08	
d. Reading (LMET Journal, etc.)	3.40	3.08	3.30	3.04	3.36	3.60	3.05	3.36	
e. Participating in group exercises	3.92	3.85	4.04	3.81	3.85	4.07	*	4.19	
f. Writing	3.27	3.16	3.21	3.05	3.22	3.45	3.00	3.59	
g. Taking tests (Self-assessment instruments)	3.57	3.33	*	*	*	*	*	*	
h. Viewing films	*	*	3.43	3.78	4.04	*	4.00	*	
i. Writing in Student Personal Journal	3.57	3.35	3.29	3.26	3.37	3.46	3.38	3.64	

* Activity did not take place.

Table C-4. Participant Perceptions of Learning Areas.
(Percent Mentioning Each)

Task	• This LMET course is designed to increase your skills in many areas. Which did you learn something about today?	Time of Response									
		Day 1	Day 2	Day 3*	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9		
Task Achievement	Concern for achievement	69	90	100	37	52	59	70	78		
	Taking initiative	65	78	83	48	48	44	59	59		
	Setting goals	77	85	100	41	44	52	90	78		
	Coaching others	54	59	83	52	59	37	48	37		
	Technical problem solving	42	33	83	48	52	67	56	44		
Skillful Use of Influence	Concern for influence	50	37	50	59	41	33	48	44		
	Influencing others	65	44	67	70	48	52	59	41		
	Conceptualizing a problem	38	33	50	30	59	59	48	44		
	Team building	58	52	100	30	63	70	67	37		
	Rewarding others	65	33	67	30	44	26	67	37		
	Self-control	31	44	17	74	67	74	85	63		

* N = 6

Legend



Subcompetency not included in lesson.

Table C-4. Participant Perceptions of Learning Areas.
(Percent Mentioning Each) (Cont'd)

	• This LMET course is designed to increase skills in many areas. Which did you learn something about today?	Time of Response									
		Day 1	Day 2	Day 3*	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9		
Management Control	Planning and organizing	50	62	83	30	70	67	59	85		
	Directing others	50	30	67	52	63	37	63	30		
	Delegating responsibility to others	35	26	100	22	44	59	63	37		
	Optimizing (people-tasks)	35	33	100	30	81	90	70	52		
	Monitoring results	69	70	100	48	81	67	74	59		
Advising and Counseling	Resolving conflicts	42	37	50	70	44	41	70	44		
	Giving feedback	54	70	100	59	90	85	78	63		
	Listening to others	65	59	83	100	74	78	70	63		
	Understanding others	50	37	83	90	59	44	56	52		
	Helping others	65	44	100	78	56	52	56	52		
	Positive expectations	58	74	67	44	37	37	44	48		

* N = 6

Legend



Subcompetency not included in lesson.

Table C-4. Participant Perceptions of Learning Areas.
(Percent Mentioning Each) (Cont'd)

	Time of Response									
	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3*	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This LMET course is designed to increase skills in many areas. Which did you learn something about today? 	23	31	50	37	15	19	37	22		
	Coerciveness									
	19	56	33	22	15	15	33	30		
	Negative expectations									
	12	4	17	56	19	15	48	26		
Coercion	23	33	17	37	19	22	22	30		
	Acting impulsively									
	12	19	33	22	37	22	30	22		
Failing to resolve conflicts										

* N = 6

Legend



Subcompetency not included in lesson.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

- 1 Human Resource Management and
Personal Affairs Department
NMPC-62
Department of the Navy (Building 212)
Washington, D.C. 20370 (Washington Navy Yard)
- 2 Human Resource Management and
Personal Affairs Department
NMPC-6C
Department of the Navy (Building 212)
Washington, D.C. 20370 (Washington Navy Yard)
- 1 Commanding Officer
Naval Amphibious School,
Little Creek
Naval Amphibious Base
Norfolk, VA 23521
ATTN: CDR Brenton
- 1 Commanding Officer
Naval Amphibious School, Coronado
Building 401 Coronado
San Diego, CA 92155
ATTN: CDR Mumford
- 1 Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station Memphis
Millington, TN 38053
ATTN: CAPT J.F. Donovan
- 1 McBer and Company
137 Newbury Street
Boston, MA 02116
ATTN: Dr. Richard Boyatzis
- 2 Chief of Naval Education and
Training
(Code N-501)
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508
ATTN: LCDR J. Sapp
- 1 Chief of Naval Operations
(OP-15)
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20370
- 1 Navy Personnel Research and
Development Center
(Code 307)
San Diego, CA 92152
ATTN: Mr. Ed Thomas
- 2 Defense Documentation Center
Building 5
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314